THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

rary

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

OF THE

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

2 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXIII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TO THE THIRD DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1902.

THIRTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

1902.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

616998

8472

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 WILL. I. to 34 GEO. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 GEO. III. to 40 GEO. III.
1760-1800

(FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 35	41 GEO. III.	1801
— 36	42 —	1802

(SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 36	42 GEO. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(SECOND PARLIAMENT—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44 GEO. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45 —	1805
— 6 & 7	46 —	1806

(THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47 GEO. III.	1806-7

(FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48 GEO. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49 —	1809
— 15 — 17	50 —	1810
— 18 — 20	51 —	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52 —	1812

(FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53 GEO. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54 —	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55 —	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56 —	1816
— 35 & 36	57 —	1817
— 37 — 38	58 —	1818

(SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59 GEO. III.	1819
— 41	60 —	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830

(SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 GEO. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2 —	1821
— 6 — 7	3 —	1822
— 8 — 9	4 —	1823
— 10 — 11	5 —	1824
— 12 — 13	6 —	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7 —	1826

(EIGHTH PARLIAMET.)

Vol. 16	7 GEO. IV	1826
— 17	8 —	1827
— 18 & 19	9 —	1828
— 20 — 21	10 —	1829
— 22 to 25	11 —	1830

Third Serie

REIGN OF WILLIAM I.—1830 to 1837

(NINTH PARLIMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 WII IV.	1830-1

(TENTH PARIMENT.)

Vol. 4 to 8	2 WI. IV.	1831
— 9 — 14	3 —	1832

(ELEVENTH RLIAMENT.)

Vol. 15 to 20	4 WL. IV.	1833
— 21 — 25	5 —	1834

(TWELFTH RLIAMENT.)

Vol. 26 to 30	6 ILL. IV.	1835
— 31 — 35	7 —	1836
— 36 — 38	8 —	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	VICTORIA	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	59	4	VICTORIA	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(FIFTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	95	10	VICTORIA	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 — 107	12	—	1849
—	108 — 113	13	—	1850
	114 — 118	14	—	1851
—	119 — 122	15	—	(a) 1852

(SIXTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	123	15	VICTORIA	(b) 1852
—	124 to 29	16	—	1853
—	130 — 35	17	—	1854
—	136 — 39	18	—	1855
—	140 — 13	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(SEVENTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	145 to 14	20	VICTORIA	(b) 1857
—	148 — 15	21	—	1858
—	152 — 15	22	—	(a) 1859

(EIGHTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	VICTORIA	(b) 1859
—	156 — 160	23	—	1860
—	161 — 164	24	—	1861
—	165 — 168	25	—	1862
—	169 — 172	26	—	1863
—	173 — 176	27	—	1864
—	177 — 180	8	—	1865

(NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	181 to 184		VICTORIA	1866
—	185 — 189		—	1867
—	190 — 193		—	1867-8

(TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	VICTORIA	1868-9
—	199 — 203	33	—	1870
—	204 — 208	34	—	1871
—	209 — 213	35	—	1872
—	214 — 217	36	—	1873

(TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	VICTORIA	1874
—	222 — 226	38	—	1875
—	227 — 231	39	—	1876
—	232 — 236	40	—	1877
—	237 — 242	41	—	1878
—	243 — 249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	VICTORIA	(b) 1880
—	257 — 265	44	—	1881
—	266 — 273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 — 292	47	—	1884
—	293 — 301	48	—	1884-5

(TWENTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	VICTORIA	(a) 1886

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49	VICTORIA	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 — 332	51	—	1888
—	333 — 340	52	—	1889
—	341 — 348	53	—	1890
—	349 — 356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	VICTORIA	1892

(TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	7	56	VICTORIA	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	36	59	VICTORIA	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	88	64	VICTORIA	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	EDWARD VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 113	2	—	1902

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury and Lord Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour.
Lord President of the Council——His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Earl of Halsbury.
Secretaries of State——
  Foreign Affairs——Most Hon. the Marquess of Lansdowne, K.G.
  Home Department——Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas, M.P.
  Colonial——Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P.
  War——Rt. Hon. W. St. John Brodrick, M.P.
  India——Rt. Hon. Lord George Hamilton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. Chas. T. Ritchie, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Selborne.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Gerald W. Balfour, M.P.
Postmaster-General——Austen Chamberlain, Esq., M.P.
Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. Walter H. Long, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. R. W. Hanbury, M.P.
President of the Board of Education——The Most Noble the Marquess of Londonderry.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——Sir A. Acland-Hood, Bt., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——W. Hayes Fisher, Esq., M.P.
Secretary of the Board of Education——Sir William Anson, Bt., M.P.
Secretary to the Admiralty——Hugh O. Arnold-Forster, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——
  H. T. Anstruther, Esq., M.P.
  Hon. Ailwyn Fellowes, M.P.
  H. W. Forster, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——
  Vice-Admiral Lord W. T. Kerr, K.C.B.
  Vice-Admiral A. L. Douglas.
  Rear-Admiral W. H. May, M.V.O.
  Capt. John Durnford, C.B., D.S.O.
Civil Lord of the Admiralty——E. G. Pretyman, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Foreign Office——Lord Cranborne, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Home Office——Hon. T. H. Cochrane, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow, G.C.M.G.
Parliamentary Secretary, India Office——Rt. Hon. Earl Percy, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Hardwicke.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——A. Bonar Law, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——J. Grant Lawson, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary, War Office——Lord Stanley, M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir R. B. Finlay, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Rt. Hon. E. Carson, K.C., M.P.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Walrond, Bt., M.P.
First Commissioner of Works——Rt. Hon. Lord Windsor.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Judge Advocate-General——Rt. Hon. Sir F. H. Jeune, K.C.B., President Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Earl of Clarendon.
Vice Chamberlain——Sir A. Acland Hood, Bt., M.P.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, G.C.V.O.
Master of the Horse——His Grace the Duke of Portland, K.G., G.C.V.O.
Paymaster-General——His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.
Comptroller of the Household——Viscount Valentia, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Victor C. W. Cavendish, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Buckhounds——Right Hon. Lord Chesham.
Captain Yeomen of the Guard—Rt. Hon. Earl Waldegrave.

Lords-in-Waiting——
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Kintore, G.C.M.G.
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Denbigh.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Churchill, K.C.V.O.
- Rt. Hon. Earl Howe.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Lawrence.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Bagot.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Suffield, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Kenyon.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.
Lord Justice-General——Rt. Hon. J. B. Balfour.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. A. Graham Murray, K.C., M.P.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinsburgh, C.B.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of Montrose, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Rt. Hon. Earl of Leven and Melville.
Solicitor-General——Charles Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant——Rt. Hon. Earl Cadogan, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
Chief Secretary——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir David Harrel, K.C.B., K.C.V.O.
Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction——President: The Rt. Hon. the Chief Secretary for Ireland; Vice-President: Rt. Hon. Horace Plunkett.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Geo. Wright, Esq., K.C.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Morley.
Clerk of Parliaments——Henry J. L. Graham, Esq., C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs——R. W. Monro, Esq.
Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
  Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
  Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
  Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
Other Clerks——W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.; C. L. Anstruther, Esq. (Clerk attending the Table); Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills); H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.; E. C. Vigors, Esq.; and A. Tennyson, Esq.
Accountant——G. Fulkes, Esq.
Copyist——Mr. T. A. Court; Assistant Copyist——Mr. H. P. Norris.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, A. M. Stoll, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip.
Librarian——S. Arthur Strong, Esq.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. W. Worfell.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Gen. Sir Michael A. S. Biddulph, G.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—(*Cont.*)

Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. B. Gallop, H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, J. B. Forsyth, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. T. Kendrick.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. C. J. Williams.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. Patey.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtney Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
    Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq.
    Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
    Committee Office——R. Dickinson, Esq.
    Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——F. St. George Tupper, Esq ; H. C. Tower, Esq. ; C. V. Frere, Esq. ; L. T. Le Marchant, Esq. ; G. C. Giffard, Esq. ; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Assistant Clerks——S. L. Simeon. Esq. ; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq. ; E. C. Howe Browne, Esq. ; Horace West, Esq. ; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq. ; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq. ; Percy A. Bull, Esq. ; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq. ; W. E. Grey, Esq. ; F. C. Holland, Esq. ; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.
Junior Clerks——H. C. Dawkins, Esq. ; A. F. B. Williams, Esq. ; R. P. Colomb, Esq. ; B. H. Fell, Esq. ; R. E. Childers, Esq. ; J. Scott Porter, Esq. ; F. C. Bramwell, Esq. ; W. T. Legge, Esq. ; C. R. Turner, Esq. ; W. K. Gibbons, Esq. ; A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq. ; K. J. C. Moorsom, Esq. ; C. D. Robertson, Esq. ; R. D. Radcliffe, Esq.
Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.
Assistant Sergeant——W. H. Erskine, Esq.
Chaplain to the House——Rev. Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Edward Gully, Esq.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. Chandos Leigh, K.C., K.C.B.
Trainbearer——Mr. J. French.
Messenger——Mr. W. Murrell.
Collectors of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.
Referee of Private Bills——Alfred Bonham Carter, Esq., C.B.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Vote Office——
    Chief Clerk——H. A. M. Killick, Esq.
    Assistant Clerks——Philip Smith, Esq. ; H. Otway Mayne, Esq.
    Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.
Librarian——R. C. Walpole, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——Temple Francks, Esq., B.C.L. ; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart ; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin, W. Hague.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Printers——
    Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
    Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq.
Postmaster——Mr. Edmund W. Pike ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn.
Office Keeper——Mr. W. Harvey.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Fielden Mitchell.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.
Messengers——Messrs. J. J. Shelvey, C. Davie, W. Quantrill, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward, J. Ivory, G. Norman.
Doorkeepers——Mr. W. Wilson, Mr. M. Inglefield.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. H. Hambling, Mr. C. Woodcraft, Mr. R. Robertson, Mr. J. Hills, Mr. J. Sprague, Mr. A. Andrews, Mr. T. B. Spray, Mr. G. Tye, Mr. R. Hobby, Mr. G. Anstey, Mr. J. H. Day.
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. J. Henderson, G. Wainwright, J. Guyatt, R. Turtle, A. Haskell, A. C. Johnson, G. Clapperton, H. E. Linington.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. Henley ; Assistant——Mr. W. Broadbent ; Porters——Messrs. J. Oram, T. Martin.
Chief Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. Scantlebury.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_october-6-november-3-1902_113

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXIII.

THIRTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1902.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 16TH OCTOBER, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the following Papers having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI. viz.—

TRADE REPORTS.—I. ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 2875. West Africa (Liberia). (August 13.)
No. 2876. France (French Guiana). (August 13.)
No. 2877. France (Society Islands). (August 13.)
No. 2878. Japan (Shimonoski and Maji). (August 14.)
No. 2879. Sweden (Gothenburg). (August 16.)
No. 2880 Portugal (Quilimane). (August 16.)
No. 2881. France (Algeria). (August 16.)
No. 2882. Finances of Netherlands. (August 19.)
No. 2883. Netherlands (Dutch Guinea). (August 21.)
No. 2884. Turkey (Baghdad). (August 21.)
No. 2885. Chile. (August 26.)
No. 2886. Paraguay. (August 26.)
No. 2887. Italy (Sicily). (August 27.)
No. 2888. Brazil (Bahia and Sergipe). (August 27.)
No. 2889. United States (Phillippine Islands). (August 28.)
No. 2890. Portugal (Oporto). (August 28.)
No. 2891. France (New Caledonia). (August 28.)
No. 2892. Germany (Dantzig). (August 29.)
No. 2893. Zanzibar. (September 8.)
No. 2894. United States. (September 8.)
No. 2895. Austria-Hungary (Fiume). (September 8.)
No. 2896. Italy (Rome and District). (September 10.)
No. 2897. Russia (Finland). (September 10.)
No. 2898. Siam (Bangkok). (September 10.)
No. 2899. Japan (Nagasaki). (September 10.)
No. 2900. Japan (Hakodate). (September 10.)
No. 2901. Belgium. (September 16.)

Oct. 16.] *Page*

No. 2902. Netherlands (Curacoa and Dependencies). (September 20.)
No. 2903. Africa (East Africa Protectorate). (September 25.)
No. 2904. Russia (Odessa). (September 25.)
No. 2905. China (Kiungchow). (October 3.)
No. 2906. China (Ichang). (October 11.) 11

II.—MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 580. United States: Coal Industry of the Consular District of Chicago. (September 20.)
No. 581. United States: Report on the Cattle and Meat Trade. (October 10.)
No. 582. France: Chemical and Metal Industries of Lyons District. (October 10.)
No. 583. United States: Report on the Iron Ore Industry. (October 11.) 3

COLONIES—I. ANNUAL REPORTS.

No. 359. Gibraltar, 1901. (August 13.)
No. 360. Straits Settlements, 1901. (September 2.)
No. 361. Sierra Leone, 1901. (September 5.)
No. 362. British Honduras, 1901. (September 8.)
No. 363. Turks and Caicos Islands, 1901. (September 8.)
No. 364. Seychelles, 1901. (September 26.)
No. 365. Bahamas, 1901; with Report of Salt Industry of Inagua. (September 27.)
No. 366. Fiji, 1901. (October 3.)
No. 367. Ceylon, 1901. (October 10.)
No. 368. Barbadoes, 1901. (October 14.) 3

II. MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS.

No. 20. Wei-Hai-Wei. (September 2.)
No. 21. Dominica. (October 10.) 3

PATRIOTIC FUND.—Fortieth Report of the Royal Commissioners. (August 14.) 3

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Abstracts showing the acreage under crops and the number of live stock in each county and province, 1901-1902. (August 18.) 3

LUNACY (IRELAND).—Fifty-first Report with appendices of the Inspectors of Lunatics in Ireland, for the year 1901. (August 18.) 4

FISHERIES (IRELAND).—Report of the Department of Agricultural and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the sea and inland fisheries of Ireland, for the year 1901. Part I. General Report. (August 18.) 4

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

1.—(Judicial Rents)—Return for the month of December, 1901. (August 20.)
2.—(Proceedings)—Return for the months of April, May, and June 1902. (August 22.)
Return for the month of July, 1902. (September 23.)... 4

SALMON FISHERIES (ROYAL COMMISSION ON SALMON FISHERIES).—Report of the Commissioners on Salmon Fisheries—
Part II.—Minutes of evidence and indices. (August 22.)
Part III.—Appendix (Section I. and II.) (September 1.) 4

Oct. 16.] *Page*

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES, (1901)—Area, houses, and population; population classified by ages, condition as to marriage, occupations, birthplaces and infirmities—
1. County of Devon. (August 26.)
2. County of Hants (Southampton.) (August 26.)
3. County of Surrey. (August 26.)
4. County of Gloucester. (September 10.)
5. County of Sussex. (September 10.)
6. County of Worcester. (September 20.)
7. County of Northumberland. (September 20.)
8. County of Nottingham. (September 20.)
9. County of Norfolk. (October 13.)
10. County of Lincoln. (October 13.)
11 County of Derby. (October 13.) 4

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).—The Twentieth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, for the year 1901. Part III. Scientific Investigation. (August 26.) 4

EXPLOSIVES.

1. Accident at Messrs. Pain and Sons' Factory at Mitcham, Surrey. Report to the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by Captain A. P. H. Desborough, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, on the circumstances attending an accident which occurred in the building for non-explosive ingredients at the factory of Messrs. James Pain and Sons, at Mitcham, Surrey, on the th of June, 1902. (August 27.)
2. Explosion of Detonators at the Patent Electric Shot Firing Company's Factory near Chorley, Lancashire. Report to the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Major A. O. Key, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, on the circumstances attending an accident which occurred at the factory of the Patent Electric Shot Firing Company, near Chorley, Lancashire, on the 19th June, 1902. (September 16.) 5

BANKING, RAILWAY, AND SHIPPING STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Report for the year 1902. (August 29.)... 5

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES).—Report of the Commissioners of Prisons and the Directors of Convict Prisons, with appendices, for the year ended 31st March, 1902. (August 29.) 5

ARMY.

1. Report on trials of self-propelled lorries for military purposes, at Aldershot, from 4th to 19th December, 1901. (August 29.)
2. Special Pensions—Return for the year ended 31st March, 1902, of pensions specially granted under Articles 730, 1173A, and the Army Pay Warrant. (September 3.)
3. Report on the discipline and management of military prisons. (September 20.)
4. Report of the Court of Enquiry on the administration of the Army Re-mount Department. (October 3.)
5. War in South Africa—Return of Military Forces in South Africa, 1899-1902; strength of garrison on 1st August 1899; re-inforcements and casualties, etc., between 1st August, 1899 and 31st May, 1902; continuation of [Cd. 892]. (August 29.) ... — 5

Oct. 16.] *Page*

INDIA.

1. Statistical Abstract relating to British India from 1891-1892 to 1901: Thirty-sixth Number. (September 3.)
2. Review of the Trade of India in 1900-1901. (September 5.) 6

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE (INDIAN SECTION).—Annual Report for the year 1901-1902. (September 3.) 6

WEST INDIES.—Correspondence relating to the volcanic eruptions in St. Vincent and Martinique in May, 1902; with map and appendix. (September 4.)... 6

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1898.—Return showing the total payments into and out of the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account, for the financial year 1901-1902. (September 4.) 6

PETERHEAD HARBOUR.—Reports respecting Peterhead Harbour Works (in continuation of [Cd. 813]). (September 5.) 6

SOUTH AFRICA.—Papers relating to an interview between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and Generals Botha, De Wet, and De La Rey, on 5th September, 1902. (September 8.) 6

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Lists of Schools under the administration of the Board, 1901-1902.

Report for the year 1901 on the Museums, Colleges, and Institutions under the administration of the Board.

Grants paid to School Boards under Section 97, Elementary Education Act, 1870.

School Board Accounts.

List of Loans.

Report of the Board for the year 1901-1902. (September 11.) ... 6

TREATY SERIES, NO. 12 (1902).—Convention regulating the telephone service between Great Britain and France; signed at Paris, 29th July, 1902. (September 13.) 6

QUEENSLAND.—Papers relating to the Pacific Island Labourers Act (1901) of the Commonwealth of Australia. (September 20.) 7

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.—Annual Report for the year 1901. (September 22.) 7

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.—Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops for the year 1901. Part II. Tables. (September 27.) ... 7

STRAITS SETTLEMENTS.—Reports on the Federated Malay States for 1901. (October 3.) 7

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (GREAT BRITAIN).—Forty-fifth Report, for the year 1901, of the Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools. Part II. General Report and Appendices III. to XI. (October 3.) ... 7

VENTILATION OF FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS.—First Report, with Appendices, of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into the Ventilation of Factories and Workshops. (October 13.) 7

Oct. 16.]

Page

RAILWAY SERVANTS (HOURS OF LABOUR).—Return, in pursuance of Section 4 of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1899, of railway servants of certain classes who were on one or more occasions during the month of December, 1901, on duty on the railways of the United Kingdom for more than twelve hours at a time, or who, after being on duty more than twelve hours, were allowed to resume work with less than nine hours' rest. (October 14.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 7

TREATY SERIES, NO. 13 (1902).—Declaration amending Article XI. of the Treaty between the United Kingdom and Austria-Hungary of 3rd December, 1873, for the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals; signed at London, 26th June, 1901 (Ratifications exchanged at London, 25th June, 1902) ... 7

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.—Returns of accidents and casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several railway companies in the United Kingdom during the six months ending June, 1902, in pursuance of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1871; together with reports of the inspecting officers, assistant inspecting officers, and sub-inspectors of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain accidents which were inquired into 8

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Appendix, Section III., to the Annual Report of the Commissioners, for the year 1901 8

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (IRELAND).—Fortieth Report of the Inspector, for the year 1901.

Presented [by Command,] and ordered to lie on the Table 8

COMPANIES (WINDING UP) ACT, 1890.—General Rule, dated 14th August, 1902 8

SUPERANNUATION.

I. Treasury Minutes, dated 14th August and 2nd September, 1902, declaring that, for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of (*a*) Inspector of Fisheries (Board of Trade), and (*b*) such Veterinary Inspectors and Assistant Veterinary Inspectors (Board of Agriculture) at ports as give their whole time to their official duties, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service are required.

II. Treasury Minutes, dated—

1. 3rd September, 1902, declaring that John Sands, Lad, Royal Laboratory, War Office;

2. 1st October, 1902, declaring that Robert Henry, Engineer, Revenue Cruiser "Vigilant," Customs;

were appointed without Civil Service certificates through inadvertence on the part of the heads of their department.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.—Account of the receipts and expenditure of the Paymaster General on behalf of the Supreme Court of Judicature in respect of the funds of Suitors of the Court, in the year ended 28th February, 1902; also, account of the National Debt Commissioners for the same period, in respect of funds held by them on behalf of the Supreme Court of Judicature, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon 9

Oct. 16.]

Page

PUBLIC RECORDS (TREASURY).—Schedule containing a list and particulars of classes of documents which have been removed from the Solicitor's Department of the Treasury to the Public Record Office, but which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein ... 9

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.—Seventeen proclamations, dated 1st September, 1902, applying certain of the provisions of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, to the counties, county boroughs, and rural and urban districts therein respectively mentioned 9

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Additional Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland, dated 3rd September, 1902 9

PAWNBROKERS' RETURNS (IRELAND).—Returns from the City Marshal of Dublin, for the year ended 31st December, 1901 9

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AMENDMENT ACT, 1868.—Rules made by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, pursuant to the provisions of the Act for regulating the execution of capital sentences in Ireland ... 9

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1877, AND SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND ACST, 1885 to 1889.—Order by the Secretary for Scotland closing the existing Prison of Inverness 9

INDIA.—I. Loans raised in England. Return of all loans raised in England under the provisions of any Acts of Parliament chargeable on the revenues of India outstanding at the commencement of the half year ended on the 30th September, 1902, with the rates of interest and total amount payable thereon, etc.

II. Examinations.—Regulations for examinations for the Civil Service of India 9

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.—Special Exemption: Night Work (Lead and Zinc Mines)—Order, dated 22nd August, 1902, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 54 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending the special exception under that section to concentration works at lead and zinc mines, so far as regards young persons of the age of 16 years and upwards.

Dangerous and Unhealthy Industries.—Regulations, dated 12th August, 1902, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 79 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, for the manufacture of felt hats where any inflammable solvent is used 10

POLLING DISTRICTS.—Orders made by the County Councils of—

I. The county of Warwick.

II. The county of Northumberland; altering certain polling districts in the said counties.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 10

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD.—Accounts for the year ending 1st July, 1902; delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table ... 10

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

The Lord President of the Council (The Duke of Devonshire) 10

Earl Spencer 11

House adjourned at twenty-five before Five o'clock, to Monday, the 3rd of November next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 16TH OCTOBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

NEW WRITS.

FOR COUNTY OF ORKNEY AND SHETLAND.—In the room of John Cathcart Wason, Esq. (Chiltern Hundreds).—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*) 12

BOROUGH OF DEVONPORT.—Edward John Chalmers Morton, Esq., deceased.—(*Mr. William M'Arthur.*) 12

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE (IRELAND) ACT (1887) (IMPRISONMENT OF MEMBERS).—Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a letter relating to the imprisonment of two Members. 12
Mr. Swift MacNeill (*Donegal, S.*) 13

NEW MEMBERS SWORN.
The right hon. Sir William Hood Walrond, baronet, for County of Devon (North-Eastern or Tiverton Division.
The right hon. Joseph Austen Chamberlain, County of Worcester (Eastern Division).
Henry William Forster, esquire, County of Kent (Western or Sevenoaks Division).
Thomas Henry Sloane, esquire, Borough of Belfast (South Belfast Division) 15

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against; from Mexborough; and Maidstone; to lie upon the Table 15

LONDON WATER BILL.—Petition from Lambeth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 15

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: From Grays; Malvern; Chard; Yeovil; Maidstone; Keynsham; Salisbury; Rothwell; Murton; Brighouse; Queensbury; Low Moorsley; Cardiff; Easington Lane; Lea and Holloway; Great Horton; Sheffield; Keyworth; North Shields; Hucknall Torkard; Peterborough; St. George; Wolverton; Shepshed; Fenny Stratford; Stoney Stanton; Ashby de la Zouch; Pendleton; Huntingdon; Cinderford; Abersychan; Slough; Castle Howard; Manchester; Thirsk; Wirksworth; Ulverston; Cinderhill; Silsoe; Wishaw; Glossop Dale; Compstall; Ynysybwl; Bream; Ramsgate; Margate; Bromsgrove; Rugeley; Tamworth; New Mills; Hadfield; Carluke; Strathaven; Long Eaton; Stapleford; Langley Mill; and High Wycombe; to lie upon the Table 15

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for the abolition of restrictions: From Maidstone; Grays; Malvern; Chard; Yeovil; Cardiff; Huntingdon; Keynsham; Salisbury; Rothwell; Brighouse; Murton; Queensbury; Low Moorsley; Easington Lane; Great Horton; Lea and Holloway; Sheffield; Silsoe; Shepshed; Keyworth; Hucknall Torkard; North Shields; High Wycombe; St. George; Ashby de la Zouch; Wolverton; Stoney Stanton; Abersychan; Fenny Stratford; Pendleton; Slough; Newtonshaw; Alva; Manchester; Alloa; Wirksworth; Ulverston; Cinderhill; Thirsk; Wishaw; Peterborough; Glossop Dale; Compstall; Cinderford; Bream; Ynysybwl; Ramsgate; Margate; Bromsgrove; Tamworth; Rugeley; Hayfield; New Mills; Hadfield; Carluke; Strathaven; Langley Mills and Aldercar; Long Eaton; and Stapleford; to lie upon the Table 16

Oct. 16.] *Page*

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Petitions for alteration: From Queensbury; Maidstone; Grays; Malvern; Chard; Yeovil; Keynsham; Salisbury; Murton Colliery; Rothwell; Brighouse; Low Moorsley; Cardiff; Easington Lane; Larkhall; Lea and Holloway; Sheffield; Keyworth; North Shields; Hucknall Torkard; Peterborough; Glasgow; Shepshed; Bletchley; Ashby de la Zouch; Stoney Stanton; Wolverton; Huntingdon; Abersychan; High Wycombe; Castle Howard; Manchester; Wirksworth; Ulverston; Cinderhill; Silsoe; Thirsk; Wishaw; Glossop Dale; Compstall; Slough; Cinderford; Ynysybwl; Bream; Ramsgate; Margate; Bromsgrove; Tamworth; Rugeley; Hayfield; New Mills; Hadfield; Carluke; Strathaven; Long Eaton; Stapleford; and Langley Mill; to lie upon the Table 16

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Parliamentary Papers (Recess).—The following papers, presented by Command of His Majesty during the Recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August, 1896 17

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Nos. 2875 to 2906 ... ...

Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).—Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Nos. 580 to 583 17

Treaty Series (No. 12, 1902.)—Copy of Convention regulating the Telephone Service between Great Britain and France. Signed at Paris, 29th July, 1902 17

Colonial Reports (Annual).—Copies of Reports, Nos. 359 (Gibraltar, Annual Report for 1901), 360 (Straits Settlements, Annual Report for 1901), 361 (Sierra Leone, Annual Report for 1901), 362 (British Honduras, Annual Report for 1901), 363 (Turks and Caicos Islands, Annual Report for 1901), 364 (Seychelles, Annual Report for 1901), 365 (Bahamas, Annual Report for 1901-2, with a Report on the Salt Industry of Inagna), 366 (Fiji, Annual Report for 1901), 367 (Ceylon, Annual Report for 1901), 368 (Barbados, Annual Report for 1901-2) ,, ... 17

Colonial Reports (Miscellaneous).—Copies of Reports. No. 20 (Wei-hai-Wei) [General Report by Mr. G. J. Hare, Acting-Assistant-Commissioner], and No. 21 [Dominica (Reports on the Caribs of Dominic)] 17

South Africa.—Copy of Papers relating to an interview between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and Generals Botha, De Wet, and De la Rey, on 5th September, 1902 17

West Indies.—Copy of Correspondence relating to the Volcanic Eruptions in St. Vincent and Martinique, in May, 1902, with Map and Appendix ... 17

Straits Settlements (Federated Malay States).—Copy of Reports on the Federated Malay States for 1901 18

Queensland.—Copy of Papers relating to the Pacific Island Labourers' Act, 1901, of the Commonwealth of Australia 18

Oct. 16.] *Page*

MINES AND QUARRIES.—Copy of General Report and Statistics for the year 1901, Part III., Output; General Report and Statistics relating to the Output and Value of the Minerals raised in the United Kingdom, the amount and value of the metals produced, and the exports and imports of Minerals... 18

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES).—Copy of Report of the Commissioners of Prisons and the Directors of Convict Prisons, with Appendices, for the year ended 31st March, 1902 18

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS.—Copy of Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops for 1901. Part II. Tables 18

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (GREAT BRITAIN).—Copy of Forty-fifth Report of His Majesty's Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools for 1901. Part II. General Report and Appendices III. to XI. 18

VENTILATION OF FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS.—Copy of first Report with Appendices of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into the Ventilation of Factories and Workshops... 18

EXPLOSIONS (EXPLOSION OF DETONATORS AT THE PATENT ELECTRIC SHOT-FIRING COMPANY'S FACTORY, NEAR CHORLEY, LANCASHIRE).—Copy of Report by Major A. Cooper-Key, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending an accident which occurred at the factory of the patent Electric Shot-Firing Company, near Chorley, Lancashire, on the 19th of June, 1902 18

EXPLOSIONS (ACCIDENT AT MESSRS. PAIN AND SONS' FACTORY AT MITCHAM, SURREY).—Copy of Report by Captain A. P. H. Desborough, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending an accident which occurred in the building for non-explosive ingredients at the factory of Messrs. James Pain and Sons, at Mitcham, Surrey, on the 5th June, 1902 19

SALMON FISHERIES (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Copy of Report of the Royal Commissioners on Salmon Fisheries (Part II., Minutes of Evidence and Indexes; Part III., Appendix, Sections I. and II.) 19

PATRIOTIC FUND.—Copy of Fortieth Report of the Royal Commissioners of the Patriotic Fund 19

MILITARY PRISONS.—Copy of Report on the Discipline and Management of Military Prisons, 1901 19

ARMY (REMOUNT DEPARTMENT).—Copy of Report of the Court of Inquiry on the Administration of the Army Remount Department 19

ARMY (SELF-PROPELLED LORRIES).—Copy of Report on Trials of Self-propelled Lorries for Military purposes, held at Aldershot from 4th to 19th December, 1901 19

ARMY (SPECIAL PENSIONS).—Copy of Return for the year ended 31st March, 1902, of Pensions specially granted under Articles 730, 1173A, and 1207 of the Army Pay Warrant 19

Oct. 16.] *Page*

FISHERIES (IRELAND).—Copy of Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the Sea and Inland Fisheries of Ireland for 1901. Part I. General Report 19

LUNACY (IRELAND).—Copy of Fifty-first Report, with Appendices, of Inspectors of Lunatics (Ireland) for the year 1901 19

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Copy of Abstracts showing the Acreage under Crops and the number of Live Stock in each County and Province of Ireland for the year 1901-2... 20

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.—Copy of Twentieth Report of the Royal University of Ireland, being for the year 1901 20

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).—Copy of Return of Proceedings during the months of April, May, June, and July, 1902 20

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (JUDICIAL RENTS).—Copy of Return for the month of December, 1901 20

BANKING, RAILWAY, AND SHIPPING STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Copy of Report on the Banking, Railway, and Shipping Statistics of Ireland for the half-year ended 30th June, 1902... 20

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND).—Copy of Twentieth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for tne year 1901, Part III. 20

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1898.—Copy of Return showing the Total Payments into and out of the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account for the financial year 1901-2 20

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy of Report for the year 1901 on the Museums, Colleges, and Institutions under the administration of the Board of Education 20

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy of Lists of Schools under the administration of the Board of Education, 1901-2 20

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy of (1) Grants paid to School Boards under Section 97 Elementary Education Act, 1870, (2) School Board Accounts, (3) List of Loans, for 1901-2 20

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy of Report of the Board of Education for the year 1901-2 21

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE (INDIAN SECTION). Copy of Annual Report of the Imperial Institute (Indian Section) for the year 1901-2 21

EAST INDIA (TRADE).—Copy of Review of the Trade of India, 1901-2 21

EAST INDIA (STATISTICAL ABSTRACT).—Copy of Statistical Abstract relating to British India, from 1891-2 to 1900-1901. Thirty-sixth number ... 21

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.—Copy of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the six months ended 30th June, 1902, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain Accidents which were inquired into 21

RAILWAY SERVANTS (HOURS OF LABOUR).—Copy of Return, in pursuance of Section 4 of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, of Railway Servants of certain classes who were on one or more occasions during the month of December, 1901, on duty on the Railways of the United Kingdom for more than twelve hours at a time; or who, after being on duty more than twelve hours were allowed to resume work with less than nine hours' rest ... 21

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES, 1901.—Copy of Census of England and Wales, 1901 (Counties of Devon, Hants (Southampton), Surrey, Gloucester, Sussex, Northumberland, Nottingham, Worcester, Derby, Lincoln and Norfolk) 21

PETERHEAD HARBOUR.—Copy of Report respecting Peterhead Harbour Works. Ordered, That the said Papers do lie upon the Table 21

SEA FISHERIES (IRELAND) ACT, 1883.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 11th July : *Mr. Moore*]; to lie upon the Table 22

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.—Account presented, of Receipts and Expenditure of the Paymaster General on behalf of the Supreme Court of Judicature in respect of the Funds of Suitors of the Court in the year ended 28th February, 1902, and of Account of the National Debt Commissioners for the same period in respect of Funds held by them on behalf of the Supreme Court of Judicature, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 353.] 22

SUPERANNUATIONS.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 14th August, 1902, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Inspector of Fisheries, Board of Trade, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the Public Service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table... 22

SUPERANNUATIONS.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 2nd September, 1902, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the offices of such Veterinary Inspectors and Assistant Veterinary Inspectors (Board of Agriculture) at Ports as do give their whole time to their official duties, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the Public Service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 22

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 1st October, 1902, declaring that Robert Henry, Engineer, Revenue Cruiser "Vigilant," Customs, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate, through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 22

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 3rd September, 1902, declaring that John Sands, lad, Royal Laboratory, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate, through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 22

EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN ENGLAND).—Copy presented, of Return of all Loans raised in England, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on the 30th September, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 354.] 22

Oct. 16.]

Page

EAST INDIA (EXAMINATIONS).—Copy presented, of Regulations for Examinations for the Civil Service of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 23

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Fortieth Report of the Inspector for the year 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 23

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Appendix, Section III., to the Sixty-eighth Report of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, for the year 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 23

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (PROCLAMATIONS).—Copies presented, of Seventeen Proclamations, dated 1st September, 1902, applying certain of the provisions of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, to the counties, county boroughs, and rural and urban districts in Ireland therein respectively mentioned [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 23

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Rules made by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, pursuant to the provisions of the Capital Punishment Amendment Act, 1868, for regulating the execution of Capital Sentences in Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 23

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Additional Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland, dated 3rd September, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 23

PAWNBROKERS' RETURNS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Returns from the City Marshal of Dublin for the year ended 31st December, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 24

NAVY (COURTS MARTIAL).—Copy presented, of Return of the number of Courts Martial held and Summary Punishments inflicted during the year 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 24

GREENWICH OBSERVATORY.—Copy presented, of Report of the Astronomer Royal to the Board of Visitors of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 24

NAVY (SHIPS' BOILERS).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 13th May; *Lord Charles Beresford*]; to lie upon the Table 24

NAVAL TRAINING SHIPS.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 19th June; *Mr. Charles M'Arthur*]; to lie upon the Table 24

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF WARWICK).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Warwick on the 5th May, 1902, altering certain Polling Districts in the County [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 24

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF NORTHUMBERLAND).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Northumberland altering certain Polling Districts in the County [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 24

Oct. 16.] *Page*

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS (SPECIAL EXCEPTION—NIGHT WORK—LEAD AND ZINC MINES).—Copy presented, of Order dated 22nd August, 1902, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 54 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending the special exception under that section to concentration works at Lead and Zinc Mines, so far as regards young persons of the age of 16 years and upwards [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 24

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS (DANGEROUS AND UNHEALTHY INDUSTRIES).—Copy presented, of Regulations dated 12th August, 1902, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 79 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, for the manufacture of felt hats where any inflammable solvent is used [by Act]; to lie upon the Table ... 25

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Order made by the Secretary for Scotland, closing the existing Prison of Inverness [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 25

TREATY SERIES (No. 13, 1902).—Copy presented, of Declaration amending Article XI. of the Treaty between the United Kingdom and Austria-Hungary, of 3rd December, 1873, for the Mutual Surrender of Fugitive Criminals. Signed at London, 26th June, 1901. Ratifications exchanged at London, 25th June, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 25

ARMY (REMOUNT DEPARTMENT).—Copy presented, of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Court of Inquiry on the Administration of the Army Remount Department, together with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 25

ARMY (REMOUNT DEPARTMENT).—Copy presented, of Reports by Officers appointed by the Commander-in-Chief to inquire into the working of the Remount Department Abroad [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 25

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

1. Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890.—Copy of General Rule made pursuant to Section 26 of the Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890, dated 14th August, 1902 [by Act].
2. Mersey Docks and Harbour Board.—Copy of Accounts of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board for the year ending 1st July, 1902 [by Act].
3. Public Records (Treasury).—Copy of Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents which have been removed from the Solicitor's Department of the Treasury to the Public Record Office, but which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify the preservation therein [by Act] 25

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, the Prime Minister and the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 26

THE CONDITION OF IRELAND—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny), Mr. William O'Brien (Cork) and Mr. John Morley (Montrose Burghs); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 26

Oct. 16.] *Page*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—AUTUMN SITTINGS.

Mr. A. J. Balfour 28

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, for the remainder of the Session, Government Business do have precedence at every Sitting, and at the conclusion of Government Business on each day, Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put."—(*Mr. Balfour.*)

Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 30
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 32
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 34
Mr. Caine (Cornwall, Camborne) 37
Mr. William O'Brien (Cork) 38
Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.) 42
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs)... 43
Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) 47
Mr. A. J. Balfour 47
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 53
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 57
Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.) 58

Amendment proposed—

"After the word 'Sitting,' to insert the words 'except at such Sitting for which Motions dealing with proceedings under The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, are set down, and which, but for this Motion, would have precedence.'"—(*Mr. Flynn.*)

Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory) 59
Mr. A. J. Balfour 60
Sir William Harcourt 61
Mr. Leamy (Kildare, N.) 62
Mr. John Morley (Montrose Burghs) 64
Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 66
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 72
Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green) 74
Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) 76
Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 77
Mr. Bell (Derby) 78
Mr. Condon (Tipperary, E.) 79

Mr. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.) rose to continue the debate

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR moved that the Question be now put.

Mr. JOHN O'DONNELL remained standing in his place, amid cheers from the Irish Members, and cries of "Gag," "Cowardly," and "Fair Play." The cries of "Order" and the noise throughout the House prevented the words of the hon. Member for South Mayo being heard. He moved nearer the Speaker, and endeavoured to address the House while standing in the second row behind the Front Opposition Bench, but the prevailing noise rendered any report impossible.

Question put, "That Mr. John O'Donnell be suspended from the service of the House"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 341 ; Noes, 51. (Division List, No. 385.)

Oct. 16.] Page

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 263; Noes, 148. (Division List, No. 386.)

Question put accordingly, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided:—Ayes, 150; Noes, 262. (Division List, No. 387.)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, "That the Main Question be now put."

Main Question put accordingly.

The House divided:—Ayes, 262; Noes, 145. (Division List, No. 388.)

Ordered, That for the remainder of the Session, Government business do have precedence at every sitting, and at the conclusion of Government business on each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.

Clause 8:—

Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 97

It being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

OPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [Lords] (By Order).—Lords' Amendments to Commons' Amendments considered.

Lords' Amendments to Commons' Amendments, Clause 4B, Section 2, at commencement of section, insert ("Subject to the foregoing provisions of this section") the first Amendment, read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) 99
The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 100
Mr. Tatton Egerton (Cheshire, Knutsford) 102
Mr. Courtney Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 104
Sir W. Hart Dyke (Kent, Dartford) 105

Oct. 16.] Page

The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 105
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 108

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 191; Noes, 62. (Division List No. 389.)

Subsequent Lords' Amendments to Commons, Amendments agreed to.

Richmond Hill (Preservation of View) Bill (By Order).—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill [Lords] (By Order).—Order for Third Reading read.

Mr. Bull (Hammersmith)... 109

Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill [Lords] (By Order).—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway (New Lines, etc.) Bill.—As amended, considered.

Sir J. Dickson-Poynder (Wiltshire, Chippenham) 110
Mr. Perks (Lincolnshire, Louth) 110

The Amendment was agreed to, and the Bill ordered to be read a third time.

Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway (Consolidated) Bill [Lords] (By Order).—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

North-West London Railway Bill [Lords] (By Order).—As amended, considered; Bill to be read the third time.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.—

(In the Committee).

Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.

Clause 8:—

Mr. Lloyd-George 111

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 8 be postponed." (*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour 112
Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 115
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, N.) 119
Mr. A. J. Balfour 120
Mr. Alfred Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) 121
Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.) 122

Page

Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 124
Sir W. Hart-Dyke 126
Mr. Lloyd-George 127

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 78; Noes, 227. (Division List No. 390.)

Committee report progress; to sit again tomorrow.

Lands Valuation (Scotland) Amendment Bill [Lords].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 135

London Elections Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 135

Police (Superannuation) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 135

Police Expenses Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 135

Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill [Lords].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 135

Hospitals (Contributions) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 135

Marine Insurance Bill [Lords].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 136

Queen Anne's Bounty Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 136

Naval Prize Bill [Lords].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 136

Employment of Children Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 136

Dogs' Regulation Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 136

In pursuance of the Order of the House this day, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, FRIDAY, 17TH OCTOBER, 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

ADJOURNMENT.—Resolved, That this House, at the rising of the House this day, do adjourn until Monday next.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*) 137

Oct. 17.] *Page*

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

DUMBARTON CORPORATION (FURTHER POWERS) ORDER CONFIRMATION.—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Dumbarton Corporation (to be proceeded with under Section 7 of the Act), ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland 137

Dumbarton Corporation (Further Powers) Order Confirmation Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Dumbarton," presented, and under 62 and 63 Vict., c. 47, s. 7 (2) ordered to be considered upon Monday next ... 137

WICK BURGH EXTENSION ORDER CONFIRMATION.—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Wick Burgh Extension (to be proceeded with under Sections 8 and 9 of the Act), ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland... 137

Wick Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Wick Burgh Extension," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 27th October, and to be printed 137

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for the abolition of restrictions: From Bovey Tracy; Newton Abbot; Stacksteads; Paisley (two); Brixton; Arbroath; Falmouth; Withnell; Chorley; Water; Bacup; Torquay; Cleator Moor; Gravesend; Kilbirnie; Kilwinning; Beith; Enfield (two); Oldham (two); Walton; Wickham Market; Thurso; Eckington; Clown; Whittington; Killamarsh; Stockport; Egremont; Warrington; Edmonton; Horbury; Flockton; Derby; Heckmonwike; Aberdeen; Birstall; Birkenshaw; Doncaster; Londonderry; Trowbridge; Rutherglen; Renfrew; Horwich; Bradford; Little Lever; Chesham; Toxteth; Melton Mowbray; Tiverton; Eccles; Littleborough; Rhodes; Bridge End; Brixham; Eagley; Hull; Radstock; Frome; Stockport; Leven; Guard Bridge; Penge; Sevenoaks; Market Harborough; Glenfield; Cosby; Enderby; Broughton Astley; Liverpool; Shrewsbury; Epping; Greenhead; Churwell; Workington; Maryport (two); Kinning Park; Gloucester; Brandon; Sherburn Hill; Tudhoe Colliery; West Cornforth; Willington; Accrington; Burton Latimer; Raunds; Desborough; Mirfield; Failsworth; Beverley; Leeds; Perth; Hepworth; Droylsden; Mossley; Prestwich; Waterloo; Newtown; Siddal; Keswick; Pegswood; Cramlington; Broomhill; Bamfurlong; Guide Post; Blyth; Harrogate; Ashington; Bishop's Stortford; Bishop Auckland; Shiremoor; Oswaldtwistle; Iron Bridge; Keighley; Oxenhope; Daventry; St. Anthonys; Todmorden; and Denholme; to lie upon the Table 138

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: From Suffolk (twenty-four); Todmorden; Dean; Bury (two); Evercreech; Low Ham; Henley; Whitehaven; Cowling; Paisley; Stockton; Blairgowrie; Chelmsford; Flitwick; Newark; Ossett; Hull (two); Shepton Mallet; Oakhill; and Belfast; to lie upon the Table 138

Oct. 17.] *Page*

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: From Southport (two); Edmonton; Arbroath; Paisley (two); Egremont; Newton Abbot (two); Withnell; Brixton; Eckington; Clown; Whittington; Killamarsh; Torquay; Gravesend; Kilbirnie; Kilwinning; Beith; Oldham (two); Water; Wickham Market; Walton; Thurso; Falmouth; Stacksteads; Alva; Newtonshaw; Horbury; Flockton; Derby; Heckmondwike; Aberdeen; Bacup; Birstall; Birkenshaw; Doncaster; Londonderry; Enfield; Renfrew; Rutherglen; Warrington; Trowbridge; Bradford; Horwich; Little Lever; Eagley; Chesham; Toxteth; Tiverton; Rhodes; Todmorden (two); Brixham; Eccles; Hull; Radstock; Frome; Leven; Guard Bridge; Penge; Waterloo; West Cornforth; Newtown; Enderby; Market Harborough; Glenfield; Cosby; Broughton Astley; Churwell; Leeds; Liverpool; Greenhead; Epping; Workington (two); Maryport; Glasgow; Gloucester; Burton Latimer; Desborough; Mirfield; Harrogate; Raunds; Beverley; Prestwich; Droylsden; Failsworth; Brandon; Sherburn Hill; Tudhoe Colliery; Willington; Sevenoaks; Hepworth; Bishop's Stortford; Siddal; Keswick; Cramlington; Pegswood; Perth; St. Anthonys; Broomhill; Bedlington; Guide Post; Blyth; Shrewsbury; Bamfurlong; Daventry; Ashington (two); Newark; Bishop Auckland; Shiremoor; Keighley; Oxenhope; Denholme; and Iron Bridge; to lie upon the Table... 138

EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN BILL.—Petition from Sheffield, in favour; to lie upon the Table 139

LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.—Petition of the Midland Municipal Officers' Association, in favour; to lie upon the Table... 139

PLUMBERS' REGISTRATION BILL.—Two petitions from Leeds, in favour; to lie upon the Table 139

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: From Bacup; Bovey Tracey; Newton Abbot; Water; Whittington; Killamarsh; Falmouth; Withnell; Chorley; Brixton; Eckington; Clown; Torquay; Cleator Moor; Gravesend; Beith; Kilwinning; Kilbirnie; Stockport, Oldham; Paisley; Wickham Market; Walton; Thurso; Stacksteads; Newtonshaw; Alva; Egremont; Flockton; Horbury; Heckwondwike; Aberdeen; Birstall; Derby; Birkenshaw; Doncaster; Londonderry; Enfield; Golcar; Rutherglen; Renfrew; Warrington; Trowbridge; Bradford-on-Avon; Horwich; Little Lever; Eagley; Eccles; Chesham; Toxteth; Melton Mowbray; Tiverton; Littleborough; Rhodes; Todmorden; Brixham; Hull; Radstock; Frome; Churchtown; Leven; Edmonton; Penge; Enfield; Guard Bridge; Prestwich; Accrington; Market Harborough; Cosby; Glenfield; Enderby; Broughton Astley; Churwell; Liverpool; Siddal; Epping; Workington (two); Maryport; Failsworth; Kinning Park; Gloucester; Sevenoaks; Desborough; Mirfield; Burton Latimer; Raunds; Waterloo; Mossley; Droylsden; Beverley; Leeds; Perth; Hepworth; Bishop's Stortford; Keswick; Cramlington; Pegswood; Broomhill; Bedlington; Guide Post; Blyth; Sherburn Hill; Willington; Brandon and Byshottles; West Cornforth; Tudhoe Colliery; Bamfurlong; Daventry; Harrogate; Ashlington (two); Newark; Bishop Auckland; Shiremoor; Newtown; Oswaldtwistle; Shrewsbury; St. Anthonys; Keighley; Oxenhope; Denholme; Greenhead; and, Iron Bridge; to lie upon the Table 139

VACCINATION BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Larkhall; and, Middlesborough; to lie upon the Table 140

Oct. 17.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SEA FISHERIES (IRELAND).—Return [presented 16th October] to be printed. [No. 355.] 140

NAVY (SHIPS' BOILERS).—Return [presented 16th October] to be printed. No. [356.] 140

NAVAL TRAINING SHIPS.—Return [presented 16th October] to be printed. [No. 357.] 140

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Return [presented 16th October] to be printed. [No. 358.] 140

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

GOVERNMENT AGREEMENTS WITH THE CUNARD COMPANY, AND ATLANTIC SHIPPING TRUST.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 141

ADDITIONAL PARISH GUARDIANS IN OXFORDSHIRE.—Question, Mr. Morrell (Oxfordshire, Woodstock); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 141

COLONIAL CONFERENCE—PAPERS. Question, Sir John Colomb; Answer, Mr. Secretary Chamberlain 142

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 294.] 142

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 142
Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 143
Mr. Chas. McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange) 143
Mr. Alfred Hutton (Yorkshire, W. R., Morley) 144

Amendment proposed—
"In page 3, line 4, to leave out the word 'shall,' and insert the word 'may.'"—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the Clause."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 144
Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) 145

Oct. 17.] Page

Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 150
Mr. M'Kenna 150
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) 151
Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire W.R., Elland) 151
Dr. Macnamara 152
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 154
Mr. A. J. Balfour 156
Mr. Abel Thomas (Carmarthenshire, E.) 157
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 157
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 158
Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby) 159
Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) 160
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire) 161

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 198; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 391.) (2.0.)

Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) 163

Amendment proposed—
"In page 3, line 4, after 'shall,' to insert 'without discriminating schools provided by themselves and schools not so provided.'"—(*Mr. James Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 165
Mr. Alfred Hutton 166
Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.) 166
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) 167
Mr. Lloyd-George 167
The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 168
Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid.) 169
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 170
Sir Francis Powell 170
Mr. Wallace (Perth) 171

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. M'Kenna 171

Amendment proposed—
"In page 3, line 4, after 'shall,' to insert 'have sole control over the expenditure of all money publicly provided, and shall.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 172
Sir William Harcourt 173
Mr. Alexander Brown (Shropshire, Wellington) 175
Mr. Bryce 175
Mr. A. J. Balfour 175
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) 175
Mr. Corrie Grant 176

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 5, after the word 'efficient,' to insert the words 'as hereinafter defined.'"—(*Mr. Corrie Grant.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 178
Sir William Harcourt ... 178
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) ... 180
Mr Lloyd George ... 180
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (Wiltshire, Cricklade) ... 182
Sir William Anson ... 183
Mr. Fletcher Moulton (Cornwall, Launceston) ... 183
Mr. M'Kenna ... 184

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 87; Noes, 212. (Division List No. 392.)

Mr. Alfred Hutton ... 187
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 188
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) ... 189
Mr. Bryce ... 189
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) ... 190

Amendment proposed—

In page 3, line 6, after the word "are," to insert the words "in their opinion."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay ... 190
Mr. Humphreys Owen ... 191
Mr. Trevelyan ... 191
Mr. Whitley ... 192
Mr. Fletcher Moulton ... 192
Mr. M'Kenna ... 193
Sir Robert Finlay ... 194
Sir William Harcourt ... 194
Mr. George White (Norfolk, N.E.) ... 195
Mr. Lough ... 196

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 82; Noes, 199. (Division List No. 393.)

Committee report progress, to sit again on Monday next.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without question put.

Adjourned at twenty-seven minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 20TH OCTOBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

IMPRISONMENT OF A MEMBER.—MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a following letter relating to the Imprisonment of a Member.
Question: Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) and Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory). Answer: Mr. Speaker 201

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments... 202

Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway (New Lines, etc.) Bill [Lords] (King's consent signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 202

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway (Consolidated) Bill [Lords] (King's consent signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 202

North-West London Railway Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 202

Railway Bills.—Ordered, That the Committee on Group 12 of Railway Bills be revived, and that they have leave to sit and proceed with the remaining Bills in the Group, to-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*) 202

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 202

Dumbarton Corporation (Further Powers) Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered; to be read the third time upon Wednesday 202

WATER PROVISIONAL ORDER.—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under The Gas and Water Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Marlow Water, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Hayes Fisher 202

Water Provisional Order Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under The Gas and Water Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Marlow Water," presented.

Ordered, That Standing Order 193A be suspended, and that the Bill be read the first time.—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

Bill accordingly read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 297]. 202

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for the abolition of restrictions: From Rugby; Maidenhead; Canonby; Earley; Cargrave; Barnoldswick; Cowes; Worcester; Summerseat; Denton; Marylebone; Irvine; Hyde; Hollingworth; Chelmsford; Alltwen; Exeter; Brentwood; Holyhead; Saffron Walden; Aberdare; Bradford; Cathcart; Pollokshaws; Cambridge; West Stanley; Consett; Shotley Bridge; Annfield Plain; Farnworth; Glasgow; Fleetwood; Hulme; Fylde; Walmer; Blackpool; Blaina; Lees; Guiseley; Tunbridge; Bingley; Tipton; Leith; and Ripley; to lie upon the Table 203

Oct.. 20.] *Page*

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Petition from Pendleton, against; to lie upon the Table 203

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Petitions for alteration: From Maidenhead; Speenhamland; Cowes; Denton; Canonby; Cargrave; Colne; Barnoldswick; Summerseat; Marylebone; Irvine; Hollingworth; Hyde; Worcester; Rugby; Alltwen and Pontardawe; Holyhead; Saffron Walden; Aberdare; Bradford; Cambridge; West Stanley; Consett; Shotley Bridge; Annfield Plain; Farnworth and Kearsley; Glasgow; Fleetwood; Fylde; Walmer Bridge; Blackpool; Lees and Cross Roads; Blaina; Guiseley; Tunbridge Wells; Tipton; Leith; Exeter; Ripley; Chelmsford; Hulme; and Brentwood; to lie upon the Table 203

Local Government (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Montrose, in favour; to lie upon the Table 203

Parish Council Loans (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Montrose, in favour; to lie upon the Table 203

Prevention of Corruption in Trade.—Petitions for legislation: From Rugby; Maidenhead; Cowes; Summerseat; Denton; Marylebone; Canonley; Gargrave; Earley; Barnoldswick; Irvine; Hyde; Hollingworth; Worcester; Alltwen; Farnworth; Holyhead; Saffron Walden; Aberdare; Lees; Hume; Exeter; Bradford: Pollokshaws; Cathcart; Cambridge; West Stanley; Consett; Shotley Bridge; Annfield Plain; Glasgow; Fleetwood; Fylde; Walmer; Blackpool; Blaina; Guiseley; Tunbridge Wells; Tipton; Leith; Brentwood; Bingley; Ripley; and Chelmsford; to lie upon the Table 204

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill.—Petition from Heywood, in favour; to lie upon the Table 204

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 and 1896.—Copy presented, of Two Orders dated the 1st September, 1902, entitled respectively, the Bristol (Cumberland Tidal Basin) Foreign Animals Wharf Revocation Order of 1902, and the Bristol (Cumberland Basin) Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 204

China (No. 2, 1902).—Copy presented, of Despatch from His Majesty's Special Commissioner enclosing the Treaty between Great Britain and China, signed at Shanghai, 5th September, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 204

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, 2907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table... 204

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

India—Public Sale of Confidential Government Documents.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Lord George Hamilton ... 204

Afghanistan—Purchase of Arms, etc., in Germany.—Question, Sir Seymour King; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 205

Corn, Sugar and Coal Export Duties.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 206

Oct. 16.]

Page

SOLDIER CONVICTS IN CIVIL PRISONS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Alkers Douglas 206

LEWES NAVAL PRISON.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 206

KISH LIGHTSHIP—CONSTITUTION OF IRISH LIGHTS BOARD.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 207

FORESHORE RIGHTS, STONEY ESTATE, MALLARANNY, MAYO.—Question, Dr. Robert Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 207

RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—RECENT DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS.—Question, Sir Seymour King; Answer, Viscount Cranborne 208

CONDUCT OF POLICE AT LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 209

LISCANNOR HARBOUR, CLARE.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 209

PROCLAMATION OF QUEEN'S COUNTY—CRIME STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 209

STAIGUE FORT, CASTLE COVE, KERRY.—Question, Mr Boland (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 210

CLOSING OF IRISH COUNTY PRISONS.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 210

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.—MR. T. P. NOLAN.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 211

IRISH AGRICULTURE.—BASIC SLAG.—Question, Mr. Edward Barry (Cork Co., S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 211

ADMISSION TO THEATRES OF SOLDIERS IN UNIFORM.—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 212

GRIEVANCES OF DISCHARGED RESERVISTS.—Question, Sir Charles M'Laren (Leicestershire, Bosworth); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 212

CONTINENTAL MILITARY LONG-DISTANCE RIDES—PARTICIPATION OF BRITISH OFFICERS.—Questions, Mr. Jacoby (Derbyshire, Mid.) and Mr. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.); Answers, Mr. Brodrick 213

REMOUNTS—HUNGARIAN PURCHASES.—Question, Mr. Norman; Answer, Mr. Brodrick... 214

REMISSIONS OF SENTENCES FOR MILITARY OFFENCES.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 214

SOUTH AFRICA—REMOUNT FARMS—COURT-MARTIAL ON CAPTAIN GORDON-TURNER.—Questions, Col. Welby (Taunton); Answers, Mr. Brodrick ... 215

MOTOR CAR REGULATION.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 216

FIJI—PROPOSED FEDERATION WITH NEW ZEALAND.—Question, Mr. Caine, (Cornwall, Camborne); Answers, Mr J. Chamberlain 216

Oct. 16.] Page

OPIUM IMPORTATION INTO CEYLON.—Question, Mr. Caine; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 216

SOUTH AFRICA—WAR CONTRIBUTION FROM THE NEW COLONIES.—Question, Mr. Claude Lowther (Cumberland, Eskdale); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 217

WAX TAXATION OF THE TRANSVAAL.—Questions, Mr. Claude Hay and Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs); Answers, Mr. J. Chamberlain 217

GIBRALTAR DOCKS—LABOURERS' STRIKE—MILITARY AND POLICE ASSISTANCE TO EMPLOYERS.—Question, Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 218

SIERRA LEONE GOVERNMENT STEAM LAUNCH.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 218

LAGOS LIFEBOAT.—Question, Mr. Moon; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain ... 219

SEKONDI PIER.—Question, Mr. Moon; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 219

ROUMANIA—AMERICAN NOTE ON TREATMENT OF JEWS.—Question, Major Evans Gordon; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 219

SUGAR CONVENTION.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 220

SENTENCES ON MEMBERS — COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SPEAKER. — Question, Mr. John Morley (Montrose Burghs); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour... ... 220

BOARD OF EDUCATION—PRESIDENT'S SALARY.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 220

HONOURS—MINISTERS AND THE ROYAL PREROGATIVE.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 221

BESTOWAL OF THE GARTER ON SOVEREIGNS NOT OF CHRISTIAN FAITH.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 221

GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND PATRIOTIC FUNDS.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 221

NEW PROCEDURE RULES—"ORDER IN DEBATE."—Question, Mr. Chaplin (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 222

ROYAL PROGRESS ON 25TH OCTOBER — BANK HOLIDAY PROCLAMATION. — Question, Sir Seymour King; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 222

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

THE OPERATIONS IN SOMALILAND.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Llewellyn (Somerset, N.), and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 222

H.M.S. "TERRIBLE"—DESIGN OF GUN-CARRIAGE USED AT LADYSMITH.—Question, Sir William Allen (Gateshead); Answer, the Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 224

Oct. 16.]

Page

MILITARY SERVICE IN INDIA.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing)... 224

INDIAN IMPERIAL COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Caine (Cornwall, Camborne); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 225

ASSAM TEA GARDENS—GERMAN LIQUOR SHOPS.—Question, Mr. Cain; Answer, Lord George Hamilton... 225

SAVINGS BANK FUNDS.—Questions, Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.) and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 226

AGREEMENTS WITH CUNARD COMPANY AND ATLANTIC SHIPPING TRUST.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), and Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 227

ARGENTINE CATTLE TRADE—REMOUNT SUPPLIES.—Questions, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.), and Mr. Chaplin (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answers, The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 228

LIMERICK POSTMASTERSHIP.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) ... 230

MONASTERVAN (IRELAND) RAILWAY ACCIDENT.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 230

CORK STEAMSHIP SERVICE—SUBSIDY TO CLYDE SHIPPING COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Joyce; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 231

CONVICTIONS OF NATIONALIST MEMBERS—COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SPEAKER.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.), Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny), Mr. William O'Brien (Cork), Mr. James Lowther (Kent, Thanet), Capt. Donelan (Cork, E.), Mr. Delany (Queen's Co., Ossory), and Mr. McVeagh (Down, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham and Mr. Speaker 231

CONVICTIONS UNDER THE CRIMES ACT.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 236

SERGEANT SULLIVAN, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill and Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 236

NATIONALIST MEMBERS IMPRISONED FOR SPEECHES.—Questions, Mr. Leamy (Kildare, N.), Mr. John Morley (Montrose Burghs), Mr. Logan (Leicestershire, Harborough), Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.), and Mr. McVeagh; Answers, Mr. Wyndham and Mr. Speaker 237

JUDGE CURRAN AND THE MULLINGAR GRAND JURY.—Questions, Mr. William O'Brien and Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham and Mr. Speaker 240

SERGEANT SULLIVAN, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—POSITION OF MR. T. P. NOLAN.—Question, Mr William O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 243

Imprisonment of Mr. O'Flanagan, J.P.—Questions, Mr. William Redmond and Capt. Donelan; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 244

Business of the House.—Questions, Mr. H. Campbell-Bannerman and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 245

Irish Affairs—Nationalist Demand for a General Discussion.—Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 246

Sergeant Sullivan, Royal Irish Constabulary—Motion for Adjournment.—Mr. William O'Brien rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the conduct of the Government in Ireland in reference to the charges of forgery, manufacture of outrage and perjury against Sergeant Sullivan of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and the danger of his absconding;" but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. Speaker called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen the Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 17, until the Evening Sitting, this day.

National Expenditure.—Ordered, That Mr. Austen Chamberlain be discharged from the Select Committee.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Hayes Fisher be added to the Select Committee."—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood*)

Captain Donelan 249

Question put by Mr. Speaker in pursuance of Standing Order No. 16.

The House divided:—Ayes, 222; Noes, 76. (Division List, No. 394.)

Education (England and Wales) Bill

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith, in the Chair.]

Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Borough*) 253
Sir W. Harcourt (*Monmouthshire, W.*) 254
Mr. Seely (*Lincoln*) 255

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 6, to leave out from the word 'are,' to the word 'to,' in line 7, and insert the words 'provided by them, and, in the case of schools not provided by them, shall pay over to the managers of the school all moneys, including the annual Parliamentary grant received by them on account of the said school, subject.'"—(*Mr. Seely.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'necessary' stand part of the Clause."

Oct. 16.]

Page

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) ... 258
Mr. Alfred Hutton (Yorkshire, W. R., Morley) ... 260
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) ... 261
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) ... 262
Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) ... 263
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 264
Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.) ... 268
Mr. Seely ... 271
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid.) ... 272
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) ... 274

Question put.

Committee divided:—Ayes, 235 Noes, 99. (Division List, No. 395.)

Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) ... 277

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 6, after the word 'necessary,' to insert the words 'and for which the buildings are structurally suitable.'"—*(Mr. Helme.)*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Sec. of the Board of Education (Sir Wm. Anson, Oxford University) 278
Sir Wm. Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) ... 279
Dr. Macnamara ... 280
Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.) ... 283
Mr. Samuel Evans ... 284
Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W. R., Elland) ... 285
Mr. M'Kenna ... 286
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 287
Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) ... 288
Mr. Fletcher Moulton (Cornwall, Launceston) ... 288
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 289
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) ... 289
Mr. Duke (Plymouth) ... 290
Mr. Wallace (Perth) ... 290
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 290
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 291

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 111; Noes, 249. (Division List No. 396.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 6, after the word 'necessary,' to insert the words 'and have the control of all expenditure required for that purpose other than expenditure for which under this Act provision is to be made by the managers.'"—*(Mr. Alexander Brown.)*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."—*(Mr. Alexander Brown.)*

Dr. Macnamara ... 295
The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) ... 295
Mr. M'Kenna ... 296

Oct. 16.] Page

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—
"After the first word 'the,' to insert the word 'sole.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'sole' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Sir Robert Finlay 296
Sir William Harcourt 297
Mr. Samuel Evans 298
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 298
Mr. Lloyd-George 299
Mr. M'Kenna 300

Question put.
The Committee divided:—Ayes, 105; Noes, 241. (Division List No. 397.)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."—Debate arising.

Mr. A. J. Balfour rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 240; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 398.)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put accordingly, and agreed to.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

SERGEANT SULLIVAN, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY — MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.
Mr. William O'Brien (*Cork*) 307
Motion made and Question proposed, 'That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. William O'Brien*).
The Attorney General for Ireland (*Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.*) .. 320
Mr. Harrington (*Dublin, Harbour*) 328
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Wyndham, Dover*) 330

Mr. T. P. O'Connor (*Liverpool, Scotland*)... 333

Question put.

The House Divided:—Ayes, 117; Noes, 215. (Division List No. 399.)

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Flynn (Cork N.) 341

It being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed tomorrow.

Land Purchase Acts (Ireland) Bill.—On the Motion that the order for the Second Reading of this Bill be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn,

Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 341
Mr. Wyndham 343

Order for Second Reading discharged; Bill withdrawn.

Merchandise Marks (Prosecutions) (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 344

County Courts (Ireland) Bill [LORDS].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 344

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjoured at ten Minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, TUESDAY, 21st OCTOBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London United Electric Railways Bill [Lords]. Reported [Parties do not proceed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 345

Railway Bills (Group 12).—Sir Lewis M'Iver reported from the Committee on Group 12 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned until Thursday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock. Report to lie upon the Table 345

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for abolition of restrictions: From Stirling; Hurst Brook; Higher Hurst; Kilbarchan; Barrhead; Johnstone; Kelso; Huddersfield; Parkgate; Longwood; Paddock; Great and Little Bolton; Middlesbrough; Rochdale; Smallbridge; Handsworth; Woodhouse; Winnington; Winsford; Tow Law; Barnard Castle; York; Hindley; Epsom; Kirkby Stephen; Langdale; Bradford; Grantham; Harbury; Wood; Boston; Blakey Moor; Wellington; Barrowford; Colne; Walton-le-Dale; Nelson; Sabden; Aspatria; Crewe; Cromer; Sheringham; Tadcaster; Goole; Castleford; Buckhaven; Lochgelly; East Wemyss; Cowdenbeath; Anchor Co-operative Society; Wakefield; Carbrook; Kippax; Bebside; Reading; and Padiham; to lie upon the Table 345

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against; From Crook; Aller; Isle Abbots; Fife; Sheffield; Todmorden; Kirkcaldy; and Wilton; to lie upon the Table 345

Oct. 16.] *Page*

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: From Stirling; Tow Law; Barnard Castle; Ashton-under-Lyne; Hurst Brook; Kilbarchan; Barrhead; Johnstone; Kelso; Bolton; Rochdale; Smallbridge; Malmesbury; Woodhouse; Winsford; Winnington; York; Hindley; Longwood; Huddersfield; Paddock; Waingate; Epsom; Kirkby Stephen; Langdale; Middlesbrough; Grantham; Harbury; Altrincham; Boston; Barrowford; Colne; Nelson; Bebside; Aspatria; Sheffield; Sabdon; Crewe; Sheringham; Cromer; Tadcaster; Kippax; Castleford; Goole; Padiham; Buckhaven; Lochgelly; Cowdenbeath; East Wemyss; London; Walton-le-Dale; Wakefield; Reading; and Wellington; to lie upon the Table 346

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Worcester; St. Albans; Benson; Southport; and Southampton; to lie upon Table 346

PLUMBERS REGISTRATION BILL.—Petition from West Riding of York, in favour; to lie upon the Table 346

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: From Stirling; Higher Hurst; Hurst Brook; Barrhead; Johnstone; Kilbarchan; Kelso; Parkgate; Paddock; Longwood; Huddersfield; Little Bolton; Rochdale; Smallbridge; Woodhouse; Barnard Castle; Winsford; Winnington; York; Middlesbrough; Hindley; Epsom; Kirkby Stephen; Langdale; Grantham; Bradford; Harbury; Wood Green; Boston; Blakey Moor; Padiham; Barrowford; Colne; Bebside; Nelson; Sabden; Aspatria; Crewe; Sheringham; Tadcaster; Cromer; Goole; Kippax; Castleford; Buckhaven; Lochgelly; Cowdenbeath; Wakefield; East Wemyss; London; Brightside and Carbrook; Walton-le-Dale; Wellington; Reading; and Silsden; to lie upon the Table... 346

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petitions in favour; from Fulham and Briercliffe; to lie upon the Table 346

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Copies presented, of Five Orders in Council of 11th August, 1902, entitled The Cyprus Courts of Justice Amendment Order, 1902, The Uganda Order in Council, 1902, The British Central Africa Order in Council, 1902, The East Africa Order in Council, 1902, and the Eastern African Protectorates (Court of Appeal) Order in Council, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table... 347

EXTRADITION ACTS, 1870 TO 1895.—Copy presented, of Order of Council, of 15th September, 1902, giving effect to a declaration, signed 26th June, 1901, supplementary to the Extradition Treaty of 3rd December, 1873, between Great Britain and Austria-Hungary [by Act]; to lie upon the Table ... 347

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.—Copies presented, of Two Orders in Council of 11th August, 1902, approving Pilotage Bye-laws for the Ports of Cardiff and Waterford respectively [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 347

WINTER ASSIZES ACTS, 1876 AND 1877.—Copies presented, of Seven Orders in Council of 11th August, 1902, relating to the ensuing Winter Assizes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 347

Oct. 16.] Page

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (CAMBRIDGE).—Copy presented, of Statutes made by the University of Cambridge, and sealed on 27th May, 1902, amending the Statutes of the University [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 359.] 347

SOUTH AFRICAN (TRANSPORTS).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 21st April, Sir John Colomb]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 360.] 347

ARMY (PAY, NON-EFFECTIVE PAY, AND ALLOWANCES).—Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the Army Regulations as to Pay and Allowances sanctioned during the year ended 31st March, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 347

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION—CENTRAL FUND.—Question, Mr. A. K. Loyd (Berkshire, Abingdon); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 348

VOLUNTARY SCHOOL TRUST DEEDS.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 348

POSTAL SERVANTS' GRIEVANCES—SUGGESTED.—Question, Mr. Thomas Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 349

ENGLISH POSTAL SERVANTS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 349

INDIAN PUBLIC WORKS, RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION—REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 349

GUARDSHIP AND NAVAL TRAINING SCHOOL AT BELFAST LOUGH.—Question, Sir James Haslett (Belfast, N.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 350

SLAVERY IN ISLAND OF PEMBA.—Question, Mr. Joseph A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden); Answer, Lord Cranborne 350

PENRHYN QUARRY DISPUTE—SUGGESTED OFFICIAL ACTION.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 351

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—LACK OF BARRACK ACCOMMODATION.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 351

SOLDIERS IN DUBLIN—LACK OF BARRACK ACCOMMODATION.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 351

PRIVATE SNOWLING, 2nd NORFOLKS—CAUSE OF DEATH.—Question, Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 351

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

BARMAIDS IN INDIA AND BURMA.—Question, Mr. Caine (Cornwall, Camborne); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 352

PHTHISIS IN RAND MINES.—Question, Mr. Caine; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 352

Oct. 16.] *Page*

COLONIAL CATTLE TRADES.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) ... 353

VACCINATION EXEMPTION CERTIFICATES—CASE OF J. F. BLACK—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 353

ISLAND OF LEWIS SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 354

KENMARE (KERRY) PORT.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 354

COERCION PRISONERS IN TULLAMORE GAOL.—Questions, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory), Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.), and Captain Donelan (Cork, E.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham... 355

BELFAST DISTURBANCES.—Questions, Mr. Devlin (Kilkenny, N.), Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green), and Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 356

ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN TRADE WITH PERSIA.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.)... 357

GIBRALTAR DEFENCES.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 357

EDUCATION BILL—PREMIER'S STATEMENT ON CLAUSE 8.—Questions, Mr. John Ellis, (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe), and Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W. R., Keighley); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 358

MARTIAL LAW COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. John Ellis; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 359

THE DARDANELLES.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 359

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork Co., N.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 360

SOMALILAND. — Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 360

NEW BILL.

Poor Law Superannuation (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill.—"To provide for superannuation allowances to certain local officers and servants in Ireland, and for contributions towards such allowances by such officers and servants; and to make other relative provisions," presented by Mr. O'Malley, under Standing Order No. 31; supported by Sir James Haslett, Mr. Clancy, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Cogan, Mr. Joyce, and Mr. Harrington; to be read a second time tomorrow, and to be printed. [Bill 298.] 360

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire) ... 361

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, line 6, after 'necessary,' insert, 'moreover all schools provided by them shall be conducted in accordance with the following regulations as to religious worship and religious instruction, namely:—
>
> '(*a*) The school shall open and close with religious worship.
>
> '(*b*) Religious instruction, based upon the reading of the Bible, shall form part of the regular instruction in the school.
>
> '(*c*) No person not being a member of the teaching staff employed by the local education authority shall either give religious instruction or conduct religious worship in the school, except with the permission in writing of the local education authority, and under such conditions as the said authority may impose.
>
> '(*d*) No child shall be taken from the school in the hours during which the school is open to any other place for religious worship or religious instruction.'"—(*Mr. Humphreys-Owen.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) ... 363
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) ... 364
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) ... 365
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) ... 365
Sir Samuel Hoare (Norwich) ... 367
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) ... 368
Mr. Wallace (Perth) ... 370
Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) ... 371
Mr. John Ellis (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) ... 371
Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs) ... 372
Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) ... 373

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) ... 374

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, line 6, to leave out the word 'subject.'"—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question, proposed, "That the word 'subject' stand part of the Clause."

The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) ... 375
Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) ... 375
Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.) ... 375
Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.) ... 375

Oct. 16.] Page

Sir William Harcourt (*Monmouthshire, W.*) ... 377
Sir Robert Finlay ... 378
Mr. Bryce ... 379

Question, "That the word 'subject' stand part of the Clause," put and negatived.

Amendment proposed, after the last Amendment, to insert the words "so long as."—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse*).

Question proposed, "That the words 'so long as,' be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay ... 380
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 381
Mr. Ernest Gray (*West Ham, N.*) ... 380
Mr. Yoxall (*Nottingham, W.*) ... 381
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 282
Sir Robert Finlay ... 382

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 262; Noes, 102. (Division List, No. 400.)

Mr. Middlemore (*Birmingham, N.*) ... 385

Amendment proposed, after the last Amendment—

"To insert the words 'in their opinion.'"—(*Mr. Middlemore.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 388
Sir Wm. Harcourt ... 390
Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Sheffield Hallam*) ... 393
Sir Henry Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*) ... 394
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 396
Sir Joseph Leese (*Lancashire, Accrington*) ... 396
Mr. M'Kenna ... 396
Sir Edward Grey (*Northumberland, Berwick*) ... 397
Dr. Macnamara ... 398
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) ... 399
Mr. Lawson Walton ... 400
Mr. Samuel Evans (*Glamorganshire, Mid.*) ... 402

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 137; Noes, 263. (Division List, No. 401.)

Mr. Alfred Hutton (*Yorkshire, W.R., Morley*) ... 407

Amendment proposed, after the last Amendment—

"To insert the words 'such conditions as may be required by the local authority including the following.'"—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 410
Sir Edward Grey ... 411

Sir William Mather (Lancashire, Rossendale) ... 411
Dr. Macnamara ... 412
Mr. Samuel Evans ... 413

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the word 'conditions,' to insert the words 'not relating solely to religious instruction.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 413
Mr. Lawson Walton ... 413
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 414
Sir James Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) ... 415
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 415
Dr. Macnamara ... 416
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) ... 417
Sir James Joicey (Durham, Chester-le-Street) ... 417
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) ... 417
Sir William Harcourt ... 418
The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) ... 419
Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey) ... 420
Mr. M'Kenna ... 421

Question, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The Committee divided; Ayes, 132; Noes, 257. (Division List No. 402.)

It being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

EVENING SITTING.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill [Second Reading].—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [20th October], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.) ... 425
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) ... 427
Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.) ... 428
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) ... 428
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 433
Mr. Fletcher Moulton (Cornwall, Launceston) ... 436
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) ... 436
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) ... 438

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 176; Noes, 98. (Division List, No. 403.)

Bill read a second time and committed for to-morrow.

Patent Law Amendment Bill.—Considered as amended.

New Clause:—

> "An invention covered by any patent granted on an application to which Section 1 of this Act applies shall not be deemed to have been anticipated by reason only of its publication in a specification deposited in the Patent Office, pursuant to an application made not less than fifty years before the date of the application for a patent therefor, or of its publication in a provisional specification of any date not followed by a complete specification."—(*Mr. Calduell.*)

Clause read the first and second time, and added.

Amendments made.

Mr. Cawley (*Lancashire, Prestwich*) 442

Amendment proposed —

> "In page 3, line 6, to leave out the words from the word 'Trade,' to end of sub-Section 2, and insert the words 'may either dismiss or allow the petition, or refer it to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.
>
> "When the Board of Trade allows a petition, it may order the patentee to grant licences, or may revoke the patent, in the same manner and on the same conditions as the Judicial Committee is hereinafter empowered to make such order or to revoke a patent.
>
> "Any decision or order of the Board of Trade under this sub-Section, other than an order referring a petition, shall be subject to appeal to the Judicial Committee, who shall have full power to confirm, alter, or reverse the same.
>
> "When a petition is referred, or taken on appeal to the Judicial Committee, the Board of Trade shall make a report to the Judicial Committee, setting forth such particulars as it shall think fit, and the same shall be forthwith communicated to all parties interested.'"—(*Mr. Cawley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Brigg (*Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley*) 444
The President of the Board of Trade (*Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central*) 445
Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid.*) 446

Question put and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

> "To omit sub-Section 2." (*Mr. Whitley*)

Amendment agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed

Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament) Bill.—(Second Reading.) Order for Second Reading read.

The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 447

Motion made, and Question proposed—"That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Grant Lawson.*)

Mr. Caldwell 449
Sir Albert Rollit 450
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) 451
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 452
Mr. Walter Long 452

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed for Monday next.

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill—Order for Second Reading read.

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover.) 453

Motion made, and question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time." Debate arising.

Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 454
Mr. Sheehan (Cork Co., Mid.) 457
Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.) 458

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Thomas O'Donnell.*)

Mr. Joyce, Limerick) 459

Question put and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Thursday.

Supreme Court Judicature Bill. [Lords.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Caldwell 460

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned"—(*Mr. Caldwell*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at Three Minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, 22ND OCTOBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dumbarton Corporation (Further Powers) Order Confirmation Bill.—Read for the third time, and passed 461

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for the abolition of restrictions: from Paddington; Marsden; Jarrow; Bridlington; Hartlepool; Carlisle; Tyldesley; Guildford; Leicester (three); Great Wigston; Kirby Muxloe; Cleckheaton; and Stevenston; to lie upon the Table 461

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Martock, against; to lie upon the Table 461

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: from Coalville; Paisley; Banbury; Chipping Norton; Glasgow; Kilnhurst; Camelon; Bonnybridge; Sittingbourne; Greenstreet; Faversham; Bridgewater; Wensleydale; Paddington; Marsden; Jarrow and Hebburn; Bridlington; West Hartlepool; Carlisle; Guildford; Kirby Muxloe; Great Wigston; Cleckheaton; Stevenston; and Swaffham and Leicester (four); to lie upon the Table 461

FEES FOR BURIAL SERVICES IN PAROCHIAL CEMETERIES.—Petition from Bermondsey, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 461

MARINE INSURANCE BILL.—Petition from Leith, in favour; to lie upon the Table 461

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: from Coalville; Bridgewater; Faversham; Paisley; Godalming; Banbury; Chipping Norton; Kilnhurst; Camelon; Lennoxtown; Bonnybridge; Sittingbourne; Teynham; Marsden; Harrow Road; Jarrow; Bridlington; Hartlepool; Carlisle; Guildford; Leicester (three); Great Wigston; Kirby Muxloe; Cleckheaton; and Stevenston; to lie upon the Table 461

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Deddington; and Guildford; to lie upon the Table 462

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CROFTERS' HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS.—Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary for Scotland by the Crofters' Commission on the social condition of the people of Lewis in 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 462

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

INDIA—CLAIMS OF SIRDAR BALVANT RAMCHANDRA NATU.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 462

INDIAN VOLUNTEERS AT THE CORONATION.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 462

Agricultural Banks in India.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer. Lord George Hamilton 463

Carriage of Petroleum on Railway.—Question, Mr. Scott Montagu (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 463

Imperial Yeomanry—Machine Guns.—Question, Mr. W. F. D. Smith (Strand, Westminster); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 464

Army Certificates of Character.—Question, Mr. David MacIver (Liverpool, Kirkdale); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 464

Imperial Yeomanry—Scarlet Fever in Natal.—Question, Col. Welby (Taunton); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 464

Alleged Improper Sales at Remount Farms in South Africa.—Question, Col. Welby; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 465

Remounts—Lord Lonsdale's Position —Question, Mr. H. C. Richards, (Finsbury, E.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 465

Parliamentary and Municipal Representations for Limited Trading Companies—Practice in the Colonies.—Question, Mr. H. C. Richards; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 466

Pacific Islanders Resident in Queensland—Exemption from Terms of Pacific Islands Labourers' Act.—Question, Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 466

Flags on Private and Public Buildings.—Question, Mr. Martin (Worcestershire, Droitwich); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 466

Education Bill—Ministers of Religion on the Central Educational Authority.—Question, Mr. Frederick Wilson (Norfolk, Mid.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 467

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

South African War—Charges against British Officers.—Questions, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.) and Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 468

Army Schoolmasters.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 468

Coronation Medal for Soldiers sent Home for the Coronation.—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Brodrick ... 468

Army Reserve.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Brodrick... 469

Sanitation at Hong Kong.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) .. 469

Congo Free State.—Frontier Delimitation.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester.) 470

Oct. 22.] *Page*

Great Britain and Germany.—Secret Treaty.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Lord Cranborne 470

Germany and South Africa—Portuguese Possessions.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Lord Cranborne 471

Condition of European Turkey.—Question, Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye); Answer, Lord Cranborne 471

Transvaal Loan.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 472

Registration Duty on Cereals.—Question, Mr. Jasper More (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 472

Corn Returns.—Question, Mr. Jasper More; Answer, The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Hanbury, Preston.) 472

Religious Texts for Postal Servants.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 473

London Telegraphists and the Royal Progress.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 473

Stornoway Mail Service.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 474

Hospital Accommodation in Lewis District.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire.) 474

Crimes Act Prosecutions—Case of Thomas Maher.—Questions, Mr. T. M. Healy and Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) ... 475

Hospital (Limerick) Roads.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 476

Labourers Cottages in the Macroom Union.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 476

Hard Labour Sentences under the Crimes Act.—Questions, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.), Capt. Donelan (Cork, E.), and Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 477

Irish Executions—Rules.—Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 478

Case of Mr. O'Flanagan, J.P.—Questions, Capt. Donelan, Mr. Wm. Redmond (Clare, E.), Mr. Power (Waterford, E.), and Mr. MacVeagh; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 480

Sentences under the Crimes Act.—Questions, Mr. John Morley (Montrose Burghs), Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 480

Blacksod Bay.—Question, Dr. Robert Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 482

Oct. 22.] *Page*

RAE ESTATE, KILLORGLIN.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 483

SERGEANT SULLIVAN, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 483

IRISH AFFAIRS—NATIONALIST DEMAND FOR A GENERAL DISCUSSION.—Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland), Mr. William O'Brien (Cork); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 484

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 492

NEW BILL.

Innkeepers' Liability Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to the Liability of Innkeepers," presented by Mr. Broadhurst, under Standing Order No. 31; supported by Mr. Gretton, Mr. Bousfield, Sir Brampton Gurdon, Mr. Levy, Mr. Seely, and Sir John Brunner; to be read a second time tomorrow, and to be printed. [Bill 299.] 492

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

Amendment made—

"In page 3, line 7, after 'conditions,' to insert 'and provisions.'"

Amendment made—

"In page 3, line 7, after 'conditions,' to insert 'are complied with.'"

Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 492
Sir Wm. Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) 498

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 8, after the word 'managers' to insert the words 'or managers representing the local education authority.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 504
Mr. Bryce 508
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 512
Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) 513
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid.) 514
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire) 515
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 516

The Attorney-General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 517
Mr. McKenna (*Monmouthshire, W.*) 519
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 521

Question put—

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 140; Noes, 256. (Division List No. 404.)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question, 'That the words of the Clause to the word "school," in line 10, inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question, 'That the words of the Clause to the word "school," in line 10, inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 254; Noes, 143. (Division List No. 405.)

Question put accordingly, "That the words of the Clause to the word 'school,' in line 10, inclusive, stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 267; Noes, 135. (Division List No. 406.)

Mr. M'Kenna (*Monmouthshire, N.*) 533

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, after the word 'school' to insert the words 'and as to all matters relating to the management of the school other than the religious instruction given therein.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 534
Mr. Herbert Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 535
Mr. Bryce 536
Mr. Alfred Hutton (*Yorkshire, W.R., Morley*) 536
Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*) 537
Mr. Moss (*Denbighshire, E.*) 537
Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland*) 537
Mr. Richards (*Finsbury, E.*) 538
Mr. Samuel Evans... 538

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 141; Noes, 265. (Division List No. 407.)

Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 543

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, at end, to insert the words 'shall hold at least one meeting in each month excepting August, and shall keep proper minutes of their proceedings.'"—(*Mr. Whitley*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 544
Mr. Lloyd-George 544
Mr Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.)... 545
Mr. Bryce 546
Mr. A. J. Balfour 546
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) 547
Mr Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.) 547
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean)... 548
Mr. A. J. Balfour 549
Mr. Whitley 549

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Committee report Progress, to sit again tomorrow.

EVENING SITTING.

The Chairman of Ways and Means.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill [Second Reading].—Order for Second Reading read.

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 550

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Wyndham*).

Mr. Hemphill (Tyrone, N.) 550
Mr. Flynn (Cork Co., N.) 551
Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.) 551
Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.) 552
Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.) 552

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for tomorrow.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 553
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 554

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Edmund Robertson 554
Mr. T. P. O'Connor 555
Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.) 555

Oct. 22.] Page

Mr. Robert Spencer (Northamptonshire, Mid) 556
Sir Robert Finlay 557

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Schedule be added to the Bill."

Mr. Flynn 558
Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.) 558

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, to omit lines 39 and 40."—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

Mr. T. P. O'Connor 559
The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N) ... 559

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. Edmund Robertson 559
Sir Albert Rollit 559
Sir Robert Finlay 559
Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 559
Sir Albert Rollit 560
Mr. O'Shee 560
Sir Robert Finlay 561
Mr. Patrick O'Brien 561
Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) 561

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out lines 5 to 8, inclusive."—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

Question proposed, "That lines 5 to 8, inclusive, stand part of the Schedule."

Sir Robert Finlay 563
Mr. Edmund Robertson 564
Mr. O'Shee 564
Mr. John Wilson (Durham, Mid) 564
Mr. T. P. O'Connor 565
Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie) 566

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 160; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 408.)

Mr. Flynn 567

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out lines 30 and 31."—(*Mr. Flynn.*)

Question proposed, "That lines 30 and 31 stand part of the Schedule."

Mr. Wyndham 570
Mr. T. P. O'Connor 572
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 574
Mr. Hugh Law 578
Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.) 579

Mr. WYNDHAM rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 162 ; Noes, 76. (Division List No. 409.)

Question put accordingly, "That lines 30 and 31 stand part of the Schedule."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 160 ; Noes, 75. (Division List No. 410.)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, "That this be the Schedule to the Bill."

Question put, "That this be the Schedule to the Bill."

The Committee divided : Ayes, 158 ; Noes, 74. (Division List No. 411.)

It being after midnight, and objection being taken to further proceedings, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at half after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS : THURSDAY, 23rd OCTOBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeil (Donegal, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Speaker 589

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of York, North Riding (Cleveland Division), in the room of Alfred Edward Pease, Esquire (Manor of Northstead).—(*Mr. Herbert Gladstone*) 590

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY *v.* THE LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.—Petition of Mr. R. Hill Dane, solicitor for the Great Northern Railway Company, praying for leave for the proper officer to attend at an Arbitration and produce documents.

Leave given to the proper officer to attend accordingly.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 590

Oct. 23.] Page

Piccadilly, City and North-East London Railways Bill [Lords].—

Reported, with Special Report [Preamble not proved.]

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed ... 590

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for the abolition of restrictions: from Lennoxtown; Bridgwater; Banbury; Chipping Norton; Glasgow; Sittingbourne; Faversham; Kilnhurst; Paisley; Bonnybridge; Camelon; Teynham; Coalville; Buckley; Ewlse Place; Ilkeston, Stockton-on-Tees; West London; Willington Quay; Walker; Harwood; Darwen; Wallsend; Chepstow; Seaham; Skelton; Guisborough; Skinningrove; Amble; Loftus; Cambois; and Buckfastleigh; to lie upon the Table 590

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Strathbogie; Highbridge; Puriton; Bridgwater (two); North Petherton; Scarborough; North Staffordshire; Clophill; Suffolk; West Cranmore; and Bradford; to lie upon the Table 591

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: from Buckley; Ewlse Place; Ilkeston; Stockton-on-Tees; West London; Great Harwood; Wallsend; Chepstow; Seaham Harbour; Willington Quay; Skelton; Guisborough; Amble; Skinningrove; Loftus; Uddingston; Dalziel; Newarthill; and Buckfastleigh; to lie upon the Table 591

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Two Petitions from Kirkdale, in favour; to lie upon the Table... 591

HOSPITALS (EXEMPTION FROM RATES) (RECOMMENDATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE).—Petition from Liverpool, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 591

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (REPAYMENT OF LOANS) (RECOMMENDATIONS OF SELECT COMMITTEE).—Petition from Liverpool, for legislation, to lie upon the Table 591

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: from Buckley; Ewlse Place; Ilkeston; Great Harwood; Newington Green; West London; Stockton-on-Tees; Walker; Wallsend; Willington Quay; Darwen; Chepstow; Seaham Harbour; Skelton; Guisborough; Skinningrove; Amble; Loftus; Cambois; and Buckfastleigh; to lie upon the Table 591

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petition from Wolverhampton, in favour; to lie upon the Table 592

SALE OF TOBACCO TO JUVENILES.—Petition from Edinburgh, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 592

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIAL STATISTICS.—Copy presented, of Statistical Tables relating to the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom. Part XXV. for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 592

Oct. 23.] *Page*

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (COLONIES).—Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1887 to 1901, Thirty-ninth Number [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 592

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).—Copy presented, of Return of Proceedings during the month of August, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 592

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889.—Copy presented, of Minutes sanctioning the Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act, for the following counties: County of Huntingdon (Second Minute), dated 11th September, 1902; County of East Suffolk (Seventh Minute), dated 29th July, 1902; County of Southampton (Tenth Minute), dated 11th September, 1902; County of Oxford (Eighth Minute), dated 11th September, 1902; County of Leicester (Seventh Minute), dated 11th September, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 592

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (IRELAND) (POPULATION).—Return ordered, "giving the population (1891 and 1901) valuation, according to counties and poor law unions, of the various districts scheduled as congested in Ireland, in the following form:—

Electoral Division.	Poor Law Union.	County.	Valuation.	Population, 1891.	Population, 1901.	Number of house-holders under £5 valuation.

(*Mr. Thomas O'Donnell*) 593

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

INDIAN MUTINY.—Confiscated Estate of the Dewan of Dhar.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 593

INDIAN FOOD CROPS STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 594

COMMISSION ON INDIAN POLICE ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 595

AUXILIARY POSTMEN E.C. DISTRICT.—Holiday Pay.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 595

BALLINA POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Conor O'Kelly (Mayo, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 595

BALLYMONEY POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. William Moore (Antrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 596

Oct. 23.] Page

EDUCATION BILL.—CONTROL OF LOCAL AUTHORITY.—Question, Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answer, Sir William Anson 596

CHINA OPERATIONS, 1900.—GRATUITIES.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 590

LICENSING ACT, 1902.—HOME OFFICE REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somerset, E.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 597

STRANDING OF THE "ISLAY."—Question, Mr. Baird (Glasgow, Central); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 597

LIGHTHOUSE AUTHORITIES ACCOUNTS.—Question, Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 598

HOURS OF RAILWAY SERVANTS RETURN.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 598

PORT OF LONDON COMMISSION REPORT.—Question, Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 599

LEHUA (KERRY) FISHING HARBOUR.—Question, Mr. Bolana (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 599

NEWRY POLICE.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 599

BELFAST POLICE.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 600

PIERS AND HARBOURS IN NORTH MAYO.—Question, Mr. Connor O'Kelly; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 600

IRISH RAILWAY AND HARBOUR GUARANTEES RETURN.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 601

WHITE ESTATE, BANTRY.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly (Cork Co., W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 601

IRISH AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 601

COST OF CAVALRY AND IMPERIAL YEOMANRY OUTFITS.—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N).; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 602

REMOUNTS INQUIRY—COSTS.—Question, Mr. Pirie; Answer, Mr. Brodrick ... 602

CASE OF PRIVATE PERRY, 12TH LANCERS.—Question, Mr. Bartley (Islington, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 602

ARMY RESERVISTS GRIEVANCES.—Questions, Sir Charles McLaren (Leicestershire, Bosworth); Answers, Mr. Brodrick 603

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

NAVAL SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMME FOR 1901.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucester, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 604

RETURN OF FLEETS.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke: Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 604

Page

VOLUNTEERS AND THE NEW MUSKETRY REGULATIONS.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick (Surrey, Guildford) 605

REMOUNT INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick... 605

REMOUNT DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Pirie; Answer, Mr. Brodrick ... 606

COST OF SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.—Question, Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon)... ... 607

CUSTOMS ARRANGEMENTS WITH THE SOUTH AFRICAN COLONIES.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 608

REPATRIATION OF THE BOERS.—Question, Mr. Thomas Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain 608

BRITISH POLICY AS TO THE MEDITERRANEAN AND THE ADRIATIC.—Question, Mr. James O'Kelly (Roscommon, N.); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 608

UGANDA RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Thomas Bayley; Answer, Lord Cranborne 609

THE OPERATIONS IN SOMALILAND.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Lord Cranborne 609

NORTH SEA FISHERIES INVESTIGATION.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) ... 610

DINGWALL AND CROMARTY RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 610

CONVICTION OF METROPOLITAN POLICEMEN FOR PERJURY.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.), and Mr. William O'Brien (Cork); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustines)... 611

CRIME IN LONDON.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 612

CONGESTED AREAS IN THE WESTERN HIGHLANDS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire)... ... 613

INTERNATIONAL FISHERY CONFERENCE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 613

RATES ON GOVERNMENT HEREDITAMENTS.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy, Louth, N.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury, (Mr. Hayes Fisher, Fulham) 614

TREASURY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ROYAL PARKS.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 614

MR. JOHN BRIGHT'S STATUE.—Question, Mr. Powell Williams (Birmingham, S.); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn E. Fellowes (Hunts, Ramsey) 615

Oct. 23.] *Page*

LONDON AND PARIS TELEPHONE SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 616

TELEPHONIC COMMUNICATION WITH BRUSSELS AND BERLIN.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 617

TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. John Hope (Fife, W.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 617

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT (No. 2.) BILL.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 617

TIPPERARY AND THE LABOURERS ACT.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 618

CORK RURAL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT SCHEME.—Questions, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 618

CONVICTIONS OF IRISH COUNCILLORS UNDER THE CRIMES ACT.—Questions, Mr. O'Dowd and Mr. McVeagh; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 619

DINGLE HARBOUR.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 620

IRELAND AND THE LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 620

DINGLE RAILWAY AND FENIT PIER.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 620

SERGEANT SULLIVAN, R.I.C.—Question, Mr. William O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 621

ARREST OF IRISH MEMBERS—COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SPEAKER.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 622

USE OF IRISH COURT HOUSES FOR POLITICAL MEETINGS.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Sheehan, Mr. Delany and Capt. Donelan; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 623

CONGESTED DISTRICTS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 624

MR. MARTIN O'DWYER.—Questions, Mr. Kendal O'Brien, Mr. Sheehan and Mr. Cullinan; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 624

PREACHING ON THE CUSTOM HOUSE STEPS IN BELFAST.—Questions, Mr. Devlin (Kilkenny, N.) and Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham ... 624

SERGEANT ANDERSON, R.I.C.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 627

BELFAST POLICE PROMOTIONS.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 628

IRISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH—POSITION OF MODERATOR OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.—Question, Mr. William Moore (Antrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 629

Oct. 23] *Page*

IRISH RAILWAYS—TRANSPORT OF TROOPS.—Questions, Mr. T. M. Healey; Answers, Mr. Brodrick 629

IRISH PARKS—TENDERS FOR BULBS.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healey; Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 630

IRISH AFFAIRS—NATIONALISTS DEMAND FOR A GENERAL DISCUSSION.—Questions, Mr. William O'Brien, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) and Mr. Wm. Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 630

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT—SERGEANT ANDERSON, R.I.C.—Questions, Mr. Swift MacNeill and Mr. Wm. Redmond; Answers, Mr. Speaker 633

DISTURBANCE AT THE BELFAST CUSTOM HOUSE STEPS—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.—Mr. Devlin, Member for North Kilkenny, rose in his place, and asked leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the riotous proceedings on Sunday last at the Custom House Steps in Belfast, and the neglect and refusal of the Government to take steps to prohibit the holding of such meetings on Government property in that city;" but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. Speaker called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty members having accordingly risen, the Motion stood over, under Standing Order, No. 17, until the evening Sitting, this day 638

NEW BILL.

MILITIA AND YEOMANRY.—*The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford)* 638

Bill to amend the Law relating to the Militia and Yeomanry, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Secretary Brodrick and Lord Stanley.

Militia and Yeomanry Bill.—"To amend the law relating to the Militia and Yeomanry, presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 300.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

Mr. Alfred Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) 639

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, at end, insert 'and if the managers fail to carry out such directions the local education authority shall have power to declare such managers in default and to appoint new managers.'"—*(Mr. Alfred Hutton.)*

Oct. 23.] Page

The Prime Minister, and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 640
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 641
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 641
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 643
Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 644
Mr. A. J. Balfour 644

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) 645

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, after the word 'school' to insert the words 'including the number of days the school must be open during the year.'"—(*Mr. Helme.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 646
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 647
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 648
Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) 649
Mr. George White (Norfolk, N.W.) 649
Mr. M'Kenna 650
Sir Joseph Leese (Lancashire, Accrington) 650
Mr. Helme 651

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange) 651

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, at end, to insert the words 'including any directions with respect to the number and educational qualifications of the teachers to be employed for such instruction, and with respect to the dismissal of any teacher on educational grounds."—(*Mr. Charles McArthur*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 653
Mr. M'Kenna 654

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the first word 'the,' to insert the words 'regulation of the duties and the.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 654
Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey) 654
Dr. Macnamara 654

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Corrie Grant (*Warwickshire, Rugby*)... 655
Sir Robert Finlay 655
Mr. Bryce 655
Sir William Harcourt 656
Mr. George Whiteley (*Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey*) 656
Mr. M'Kenna 656
Mr. Lloyd-George 658

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided: Ayes, 250; Noes, 125. (Division List No. 412.)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put accordingly and agreed to.

Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) 661

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, at end, to insert the words, 'But no such directions shall be such as to interfere with reasonable facilities for instruction in religious subjects.'"—(*Sir Francis Powell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir William Anson 662
Mr. Bryce 663
Sir William Harcourt 663
Mr. Charles Hobhouse (*Bristol, E.*) 664
Dr. Macnamara 664
Sir William Anson 664
Lord Hugh Cecil (*Greenwich*) 665

Question put and negatived.

Dr. Macnamara 665

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'and shall, on all occasions when the school premises have been used for purposes over which the local education authority has no control, see that the school premises are immediately re-adapted to the educational purposes for which the local education authority requires them.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 666

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Alfred Hutton 668

Oct. 23.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"After the last Amendment, to insert the words, 'and if the managers fail to carry out such directions, the local education authority shall have power to declare such managers in default and to appoint new managers.'"—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay 668
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*)... 669
Sir William Harcourt 670
Mr. Ernest Gray (*West Ham, N.*) 670
Mr. A. J. Balfour... 673

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'shall' and insert the words 'in addition to their other powers have the power themselves to carry out the direction in question as if they were the managers.'"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Lloyd-George 674
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) 677
Dr. Macnamara 677
Sir William Harcourt 678
Mr. Spear (*Devonshire, Tavistock.*) 678
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 679
Mr. A. J. Balfour 679
Mr. M'Kenna 680
Mr. Corrie Grant 680
Mr. Ernest Gray 680

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 126; Noes, 249. (Division List No. 413.)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put:"—

Question put, "That the Question 'That those words be there inserted' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 251; Noes, 110. (Division List No. 414.)

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Words, as amended, inserted.

It being after half-past Seven of clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

DISTURBANCE ON BELFAST CUSTOM HOUSE STEPS—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.
Mr. Devlin (Kilkenny, N.) 687

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Devlin.*)

Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.) 692
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 695
Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.) 697

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 188; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 415.)

Question put accordingly.

The House divided:—Ayes, 98; Noes, 200. (Division List No. 416.)

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee:

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 11, to leave out the words 'have power to,' and insert the word 'periodically.'"—(*Mr. Levy.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Sir William Anson 707
Mr. Bryce 707
Sir John Gorst 707
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 708
Mr. Henry Hobhouse 709
Mr. M'Kenna 709
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice 710
Sir William Anson 710
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid) 710
Mr. Bryn Roberts (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) 711
Mr. George White (Norfolk, N.W.) 711
Mr. A. J. Balfour 711
Mr. Fletcher Moulton (Cornwall, Launceston) 712
Col. Pilkington (Lancaster, Newton.) 712
Mr. Sydney Buxton 714

Question put.

Committee divided:—Ayes, 198; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 417.)

Dr Macnamara 715
Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland.*) 716

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 12, after the word 'school,' to insert 'any member of that authority, or of the Education Committee, shall have the same liberty to enter and inspect the school as any manager.'"—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay 717
Mr. Joseph A. Pease (*Essex, Saffron Walden*) 717
Mr. Lloyd-George 718
Mr. M'Kenna 719
Mr. Herbert Roberts (*Denbighshire, W.*) 719
Mr. Trevelyan 720
Mr. A. J. Balfour 720
Mr. Samuel Evans 721
Dr. Macnamara 722
Mr. Moss 723
Mr. Bryce ... ...

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Committee report Progress.

To sit again Tomorrow.

Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1.

Committee report Progress.

To sit again Tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put 724

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 24th OCTOBER, 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Provisional Order Bills (No Standing Orders Applicable).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table, Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz., Water Provisional Order Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next 725

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for the abolition of restrictions: from Radnor Park; Keighley; Runcorn; Dalmuir; Cumbernauld; Vale of Leven; Nuneaton; Haswell; Exmouth; Bury; Ebbw Vale; Wrexham; Paignton; and Stanbury; to lie upon the Table 725

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Eversholt; Ridgmont; Stogussey; and North Newton; to lie upon the Table ... 725

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: from Keighley; Dalmuir; Cumbernauld; Vale of Leven; Haswell; Walker; Exmouth; Nuneaton; Radnor Park; Ebbw Vale; Wrexham; Stanbury; and Paignton; to lie upon the Table 725

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Liverpool; Sutton (two); Southampton (three); to lie upon the Table... ... 725

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: from Keighley; Runcorn; Dalmuir; Cumbernauld; Bury; Vale of Leven; Haswell; Exmouth; Nuneaton; Radnor Park; Ebbw Vale; Wrexham; Paignton; and Stanbury; to lie upon the Table 726

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TYPHOID FEVER IN LIMERICK CITY AND PRISON.—Copy presented, of Reports made by Stewart Woodhouse, Esq., M.D., Medical Member of the General Prisons Board for Ireland, and by Sir J. Acheson M'Cullagh, M.D., Medical Inspector to the Local Government Board for Ireland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 726

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2908 to 2910 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 726

ADJOURNMENT.—Resolved, That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn until Monday next.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood*) 726

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS TRUST DEEDS.—Question, Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 726

CARRIAGE OF INDIAN GOVERNMENT GOODS BY GERMAN FIRMS.—Question, Mr. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.); Answer, Lord George Hamilton ... 727

BOARD OF CUSTOMS—GRIEVANCES OF SECOND-CLASS EXAMINING OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea District); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 727

Oct. 24.] ***Page***

PROCLAIMED MEETING AT ROSTREVOR.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.): Answer, Mr. Wyndham 727

2ND SEAFORTH HIGHLANDERS.—Question, Mr. Bignold (Wicks Burghs); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 728

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 729

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 12, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'and to receive, inquire into, and deal with any complaints addressed to them regarding infractions of Section 7 of The Elementary Education Act, 1870.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 730
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 731
Mr. Alfred Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) 732
Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.) 733
The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 734
Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) 735
Sir John Dorington (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) 736
Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 736
Mr. Seely (Lincoln) 737
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 737
Mr. Black (Banffshire) 738
Sir Robert Finlay 739
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 739
Sir W. Hart-Dyke (Kent, Dartford) 740
Sir Henry Fowler 742
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 743
Sir Joseph Leese (Lancashire, Accrington) 744
Mr. Spear (Devonshire, Tavistock) 745
Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) 745
Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple) 746
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 746

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'deal with,' and insert the words 'represent to the Board of Education.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Lloyd-George 748

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 168; Noes, 79. (Division List No. 418.)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment," put accordingly, and agreed to.

Question put, "That the proposed words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 86; Noes, 171. (Division List No. 419.)

Sir William Harcourt 755
The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 755
Sir Robert Finlay 756
Sir William Harcourt 756

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 12, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'and their inspectors shall present yearly to the Education Department their reports as to the state and efficiency of the schools.'"—(*Sir William Harcourt.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 758

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Bryce 759
Mr. Lloyd-George 759
Mr. Herbert Robertson (Hackney, S.) 759

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 12, to leave out from the word 'school,' to end of line 13."—(*Mr. Herbert Robertson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'and the accounts' stand part of the Clause."

Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 760
The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 762
Sir Henry Fowler 763
Sir William Harcourt 766
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) 767
Mr. Edmund Robertson 767
Mr. Lloyd-George 767

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and moved "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 203; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 420.)

Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 88 ; Noes, 205. (Division List No. 421.)

Mr. A. J. Balfour claimed to move, "That the Question, 'That the first word "The," in line 14, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question, 'That the first word "The," in line 14, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 199 ; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 422.)

Question put accordingly, "That the first word 'The,' in line 14, stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 200 ; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 423.)

Mr. Bryce 783

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour... 783
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 785
Mr. Lloyd-George 786
Mr. Elliot (*Durham*) 787
Sir William Harcourt 787
Mr. Ernest Gray (*West Ham, N.*)... 788

Question put and agreed to.

Committee report Progress.

To sit again upon Monday next.

Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment ; to be read the third time upon Tuesday next 788

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-eight minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MONDAY, 27TH OCTOBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

Imprisonment of a Member.—Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a letter relating to the imprisonment of a Member 789

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Water Provisional Order Bill.—Read a second time, and committed ... 791

Oct. 27.] *Page*

Wick Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill.—Read a second time; to be considered Tomorrow 791

London United Electric Railways Bill.

Mr. Perks (*Lincolnshire, Louth*) 791

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Stainland; Sowerby Bridge; Hebden Bridge (two); Boldon; Haltwhistle; Wainstalls; Midgley; and Blaenavon; to lie upon the Table ... 791

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Todmorden; Hebden Bridge; Leicester; and Stewarton; to lie upon the Table 792

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition for alteration: from Stainland; Hebden Bridge (two); Haltwhistle; Wainstalls; Midgley; Boldon; and Blaenavon; to lie upon the Table 792

IMPERIAL DEFENCE SCHEME.—Petition from Baildon, for adoption; to lie upon the Table 792

OLD AGE PENSION SCHEME.—Petition from Baildon, for adoption; to lie upon the Table 792

PLUMBERS' REGISTRATION BILL.—Petition from Leamington, in favour; to lie upon the Table 792

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: from Stainland; Sowerby Bridge; Hebden Bridge (two); Haltwhistle; Boldon; Blaenavon; Wainstalls; and Midgley; to lie upon the Table 792

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INEBRIATES' REGULATIONS.—Copy presented, of Regulations made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department by virtue of Section 20 of the Inebriates Act, 1898, for carrying into effect the provisions of Section 5 of the Licensing Act, 1902, respecting the detention of Inebriates committed to Retreats [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 361.] 792

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1902.—Copy presented, of Conference between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Prime Ministers of the Self-governing Colonies, June—August, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 792

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).—Copy presented, of Colonial Reports, No. 369 (Hong Kong, Annual Report for 1901) [by Command]: to lie upon the Table 792

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.

Inquiry into Charities (County of Montgomery), further Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February, 1900; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to be printed. [No. 362.] 793

Oct. 27.] *Page*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

SOMALILAND OPERATIONS—COST.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Ritchie 793

CONGO—ARREST OF MR. RABINEK.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Lord Cranborne 793

WAIMA ARBITRATION.—Question, Mr. Bill (Staffordshire, Leek); Answer, Lord Cranborne 794

RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Lord Cranborne 794

AVOCH (ROSS-SHIRE) LIGHTS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 794

BRAUNTON (NORTH DEVON) LIGHTHOUSE.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 795

STRANGFORD—LOUGH LIGHTS—WRECK OF THE "WILLIAM BAILEY."—Question, Mr. H. C. Richards (Finsbury, E.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 795

CASE OF TYPHUS FEVER AT NESS, LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 796

SHESHADER FOOTPATH.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 796

TELEGRAPH LEARNERS—COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS.—Question, Capt. Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 796

BELFAST POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Macartney (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 797

READING POSTAL STAFF.—Question, Mr. George Palmer (Reading); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 797

COUNTY SLIGO POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 798

LEEK POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Bill; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 798

MUZZLING ORDER IN CARMARTHENSHIRE.—Question, Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 798

ADULTERATION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS—PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE.—Question, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.); Answer, Mr. Hanbury 799

SOMALILAND OPERATIONS—HOSPITAL ARRANGEMENTS AT ADEN.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 799

INDIAN UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION REPORT.—Questions, Mr. Caine (Cornwall, Camborne); Answers, Lord George Hamilton 800

ROSSCLARE RAILWAY COMPANY—DAMAGE TO ROADS IN SOUTH WEXFORD.—Question, Mr. Ffrench (Wexford, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 801

Oct. 27.] *Page*

PROMOTION CLAIMS OF RE-EMPLOYED AND RESERVE OFFICERS.—Question, Col. Legge (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 801

ARMY HAIR BRUSHES.—Question, Mr. Soares; Answer, Mr. Brodrick ... 802

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—TRANSPORT—OVERCROWDING OF THE "DRAYTON GRANGE."—Question, Mr. H. C. Richards; Answer, Mr. Brodrick ... 802

HONG KONG POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 802

SIERRA LEONE GOVERNMENT STEAM LAUNCH.—Question, Mr. Moon; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 803

SECONDU PIER.—Question, Mr. Moon; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 803

CIRENCESTER BOARD SCHOOL AND VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, Sir William Anson 803

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

REPATRIATION OF BOER PRISONERS.—Questions, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) and Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answers, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) ... 804

WOOLWICH ARSENAL PAYMASTER AND COLLECTION OF INCOME TAX.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 805

H.M.S. "MONTAGU"—TRIAL TRIP.—Question, Sir William Allan (Gateshead); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 806

SOMALILAND OPERATIONS—COST—FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS OF INDIA IN MATTERS IMPERIAL.—Question, Mr. Caine (Cornwall, Camborne); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) 806

CORONATION MEDALS.—Question, Mr. George Faber (York); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 807

ALTERATIONS IN THE PRAYER BOOK.—Question, Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 808

LOCAL LOANS—TERM OF REPAYMENT.—Question, Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 808

MOTOR CAR REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 809

ALIEN IMMIGRATION COMMISSION.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 809

UNDERGROUND TELEGRAPH WIRES—WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 810

OPEN COMPETITIONS FOR THE TELEGRAPH SERVICE.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 810

Oct. 27.] *Page*

CONVICTION OF A METROPOLITAN POLICEMAN FOR PERJURY.—Question, Mr Cullinan (Tipperary, S.); Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 811

GLASGOW RECTORIAL ELECTION DISTURBANCES.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork County, N.); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 811

ELIGIBILITY OF WOMEN UNDER THE EDUCATION BILL.—Question, Mr. Plummer (Newcastle-on-Tyne); Answer, The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 812

MEETINGS ON BELFAST CUSTOM HOUSE STEPS—COLLECTIONS.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.) and Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover)... ... 812

SERGEANT SULLIVAN, R.I.C.—EVIDENCE OF MR. W. P. NOLAN.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 813

CLOSING OF IRISH PRISONS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham

BELFAST ORANGE INSTITUTION.—Question, Mr. Divlin (Kilkenny, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 814

THE PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF DUBLIN.—Questions, Mr. William O'Brien (Cork) and Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 814

POLICE SUPERVISION—CASE OF PAT MEANY, QUINN.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 815

HARD LABOUR SENTENCES IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. William O'Brien and Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 816

GOODS RATES ON IRISH RAILWAYS.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 817

IRISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 817

KERRY FISHERIES—COOMENAUM SLIP.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 818

HARD LABOUR SENTENCES UNDER THE CRIMES' ACT—SUGGESTED GOVERNMENT INSTRUCTIONS TO RESIDENT MAGISTRATES.—Questions, Mr. Archdale (Fermanagh, N.) and Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 819

IRISH EXECUTIONS.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 820

SERGEANT SULLIVAN, R.I.C.—SUPPOSED PROMOTION SINCE HIS TRIAL.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 821

IRISH PRISON WARDERS—HOURS OF DUTY.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 821

LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEME IN CORK RURAL DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork Co., Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndnam 821

Oct. 27.] Page

CONSTITUTION OF CRIMES' ACT COURTS—MR. HARREL, R.M.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 822

SERGEANT ANDERSON, R.I.C.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 822

MCCLOSKEY v. HOLMES.—Question, Mr. Hemphill (Tyrone, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 823

AGRARIAN CRIME IN QUEEN'S COUNTY.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's Co., Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 823

ARREST OF MR. REDDY, M.P.—COMMUNICATION OF ARREST TO THE SPEAKER.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 824

PUBLIC MEETINGS IN IRISH COURTHOUSES.—Question, Mr. Power (Waterford); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 824

M'HALE v. SULLIVAN.—Question, Mr. Cullinan; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 825

CLOONACOOL EXCISE PROSECUTION.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon) 826

INCH STRAND, CO. KERRY—FORESHORE RIGHTS.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 826

LIMERICK POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Joyce; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 827

IRISH COUNTY COURT JUDGES.—Question, Mr. William O'Brien; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 827

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) ACT (AMENDMENT) BILL.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour... 828

MARINE INSURANCE BILL.—Question, Mr. Charles M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 828

EDUCATION BILL—HIRING OF DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 828

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 829

EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN BILL.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 829

VOLUNTARY SCHOOL ENDOWMENTS.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 830

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—John Lockie, Esquire, for the Borough of Devonport.

Oct. 27.] Page

IRELAND—ADMINISTRATION OF THE CRIMES ACT—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.—MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN, Member for Cork City, rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the proclamation, under the provisions of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, of the City of Dublin and of nine Irish counties since the rising of the House in August, and the danger to the public peace arising from the harsh and partisan administration of that Act;" but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. Speaker called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen:

The Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 17, until the Evening Sitting, this day 830

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

Mr. Joseph A. Pease (*Essex, Saffron Walden*) 831

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 14, to leave out the words 'consent to the.'"—(*Mr. Joseph A. Pease.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 836
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 837
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 840
Mr. Middlemore (*Birmingham, N.*) 843
Sir William Mather (*Lancashire, Rossendale*) 845
Sir John Gorst (*Cambridge University*) 847
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 849
Mr. Lloyd Morgan (*Carmarthenshire, W.*) 850
Mr. Kemp (*Lancashire, Heywood*) 853
Sir William Harcourt (*Monmouthshire, W.*) 853
Mr. A. J. Balfour 856
Mr. Asquith (*Fife, E.*) 859
Lord Alwyn Compton (*Bedfordshire, Biggleswade*) 862
Mr. M'Kenna (*Monmouthshire, N.*) 863
Mr. Edwards (*Radnor*) 865
Sir Brampton Gurdon (*Norfolk, N.*) 866
Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) 868
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 869
Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*) 873
Mr. Lucas (*Portsmouth*) 876

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 250; Noes, 119. (Division List No. 424.)

Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 245; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 425.)

Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 883
Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.) 884

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 15, after the word 'the,' to insert the words 'dismissal or.'"—(*Mr Lloyd Morgan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 885
Dr. Macnamara 887
Mr. A. J. Balfour 887
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid.) 888
The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir Wm. Anson, Oxford University) 889
Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester)... 889
Mr. Fletcher Moulton (Cornwall, Launceston) 890

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

IRELAND—ADMINISTRATION OF THE CRIMES ACT MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.—

Mr. William O'Brien (Cork) 897
Captain Donelan (Cork Co., E.) 900

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn." —(*Mr. William O'Brien.*)

Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 908
Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.) 911
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 914
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 928

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 121; Noes, 215. (Division List No. 426.)

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, TUESDAY, 28TH OCTOBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the Borough of Liverpool (East Toxteth Division),

In the room of Augustus Frederick Warr, esquire (Chiltern Hundreds).—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*) 937

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Wick Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered; to be read the third time to-morrow 937

PETITIONS.

BURGH POLICE AND PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Argyll, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 937

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Walsall; Bristol; Ravensthorpe; Codnor Park; Teignmouth; Coventry; Grangemouth; South Darenth; Dartford; Blaydon; Pelton Fell; Chester-le-Street; Clydebank; Sunderland; and Clayton; to lie upon the Table ... 937

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Cowlinge; Ipswich; Walsall; Woking; and Castlemorton; to lie upon the Table ... 937

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Bristol; Walsall; Ravensthorpe; Codnor Park; Teignmouth; Summerstown; Dartford; Coventry; Clydebank; Pelton Fell; Chester-le-Street; Sunderland; Liverpool; and Clayton; to lie upon the Table 937

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Widnes, in favour; to lie upon the Table 937

PLUMBERS' REGISTRATION BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Gloucester; and Perth; to lie upon the Table 938

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: from Bristol; Walsall; Ravensthorpe; Codnor Park; Dartford; Teignmouth; Blaydon; Pelton Fell; Chester-le-Street; Grangemouth; Coventry; Clydebank; South Darenth; Sunderland; and Clayton; to lie upon the Table... ... 938

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petition from Eccles, in favour; to lie upon the Table... 938

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AFRICA (No. 4, 1902).—Copy presented, of Report by the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway Committee on the progress of the Works, 1901–02 (with two Maps and a Section) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 938

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of Rules to be observed in planning and fitting up of public elementary schools [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 938

Oct. 28.] *Page*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

TEMPERANCE LEGISLATION FOR SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 938

INDIA—TECHNICAL AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 939

MOTOR CAR REGULATIONS. — Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 939

SIEGE OF LADYSMITH—THE "TERRIBLE" GUN MOUNTINGS.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 939

TELEGRAPH SERVICE—DECREASE OF CANDIDATES.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 940

SORTERS AND TELEGRAPHISTS—MIXED DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Schwann; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 940

DINGWALL BARRACK ACCOMMODATION.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 941

ARMY—DEFECTIVE TEETH.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 941

SOUTH AFRICA—ARMY RATIONS CONTRACT WITH M'CONNACHIE BROTHERS.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Brodrick ... 941

LUNATIC ASYLUMS RETURN.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 942

CONVICTION OF A METROPOLITAN POLICEMAN FOR PERJURY.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 942

ALTERATIONS OF THE PRAYER BOOK.—Question, Mr. Charles M'Arthur (Liverpool, Exchange); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 942

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SOUTH AFRICA—CONCENTRATION CAMPS—COST OF MAINTENANCE SINCE THE WAR.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 944

SOUTH AFRICAN SETTLEMENT—TAXATION OF THE NEW COLONIES.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 944

BOER GENERALS AT CAMBRIDGE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon)... 945

MILITARY OFFENDERS IN CIVIL PRISONS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) ... 945

WOOLWICH ARSENAL FOREMEN'S PENSIONS.—Questions, Sir J. Fortescue Flannery (Yorkshire, W.R., Shipley); Answers, Mr. Brodrick 945

Oct. 28.] *Page*

SOMALILAND OPERATIONS.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.), and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 946

CANADIAN POSTAGE RATES.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) ... 948

HONG KONG CABLE RATES.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon, (Hythe); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 948

EDWARD THE CONFESSOR'S CHAPEL IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY.—Question, Mr. Paulton (Durham, Bishop Auckland); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Hunts, Ramsey) 949

CONTINUATION CLASSES IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 949

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES FOR THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 950

CONVICT MULDOWNEY.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 950

EXTRA POLICE AT BOYLE AND CASTLEREA.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 950

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in the Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

Mr. Alfred Hutton (*Yorkshire, W.R., Morley*) 951

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 15, after the word 'teachers' insert the words 'by the managers.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir William Harcourt (*Monmouthshire, W.*) 952
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 952
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 953
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 953
Mr. Humphreys Owen (*Montgomeryshire*) 954

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 15, to leave out from the word 'teachers,' to the end of line 16."—(*Mr. Levy.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'but that consent shall not be' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 954
Sir William Harcourt 955
Sir Joseph Leese (*Lancashire, Accrington*) 955
Mr. Bryce 955
The Attorney General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 955
Mr. Edmund Robertson (*Dundee*) 957
Mr. Samuel Evans (*Glamorganshire, Mid.*) 957
Mr. John Ellis (*Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe*) 957
Mr. Bryce 957
Mr. A. J. Balfour 959
Sir William Harcourt 959
Sir John Gorst (*Cambridge University*) 960
Mr. Edmund Robertson 961
Mr. Lloyd-George 961
Sir Robert George ... ... — 962
Mr. Lloyd-George 963
Mr. M'Kenna (*Monmouthshire, N.*) 963

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 193 ; Noes, 102. (Division List No. 427.)

Mr. A. J. Balfour 967

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 16, at the end, to insert the words 'and the consent of the authority shall also be required to the dismissal of a teacher unless the dismissal be on grounds connected with the giving of religious instruction in the schools.'"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Samuel Evans 967

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'teacher,' and insert the words 'but such consent shall not be withheld if the dismissal be on grounds connected with the giving of religious instruction in the school."—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'unless the dismissal be on grounds' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Sir Robert Finlay 968
Mr. Bryce 969
Mr. Yoxall 970
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 971
Mr. Soares (*Devonshire, Barnstaple*) 971
Mr. Samuel Evans 972

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 200 ; Noes. 102. (Division List No. 428.)

Page

Mr. Herbert Lewis 975

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out 'connected with,' in order to insert 'directly related to.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'connected with' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Sir Robert Finlay 975
Mr. Bryce 976

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original question again proposed.

Mr. Samuel Evans 976
Sir Robert Finlay 977

Question put and agreed to, words inserted.

Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) 977

Amendment proposed, after the last Amendment—

"To insert the words, 'provided that, notwithstanding anything in the trust deed of a school not provided by the local education authority, assistant teachers and pupil teachers may be appointed, if it is thought fit, without reference to religious creed or denomination.'"—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Secretary of the Board of Education (*Sir William Anson, Oxford University*) 979

Amendment amended—

"By leaving out the words 'notwithstanding anything in the trust deed of a school not provided by the local education authority.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words as amended, be there inserted."
Mr. Samuel Evans 981

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, as amended—

"To leave out the word 'may,' and insert the word shall.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed "That the word 'may' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 981
Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland*) 983

Mr. Henry Hobhouse ... 984
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) ... 984
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) ... 985
Mr. Lloyd George ... 985
Sir Robert Finlay ... 987
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) ... 988
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) ... 988
Mr. Bryce ... 989
Sir John Gorst ... 990
Mr. M'Kenna ... 992
Mr. Abel Thomas (Carmarthenshire, E.) ... 993
Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) ... 994

Question proposed.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 246 ; Noes, 125. (Division List No. 429.)

Words, as amended, inserted.

Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) ... 997

Amendment proposed, after the last Amendment—

> "To insert the words, 'Provided also that it shall not be lawful for any body of managers to make it a condition of appointment in the case of any teacher that the said teacher shall undertake to perform or to abstain from performing any duties outside the ordinary school hours or unconnected with the ordinary work of the school.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1001
Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey) ... 1002
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) ... 1002
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (Wiltshire, Cricklade) ... 1003
Sir Robert Finlay ... 1004
Mr. Asquith (Fife, E.) ... 1004
Mr. Duke (Plymouth) ... 1005
Sir James Joicey (Durham, Chester-le-Street) ... 1006
Mr. Heywood Johnstone (Sussex, Horsham) ... 1006
Sir W. Hart-Dyke (Kent, Dartford) ... 1007
Sir John Gorst ... 1007
Mr. Humphreys-Owen ... 1008
Sir William Anson ... 1008
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1008
Mr. Bousfield (Hackney, N.) ... 1009
Mr. Logan (Leicestershire, Harborough) ... 1010
Mr. Samuel Evans ... 1010
Dr. Macnamara ... 1010

Question put.

Committee divided :—Ayes. 119 ; Noes, 246. (Division List No. 430.)

It being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the proceedings of the Committee.

Whereupon Mr. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the word "school," in line 17, inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

Question put, "That the question 'That the words of the Clause to the word "school," in line 17, inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 242 ; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 431.)

Question put accordingly, "That the words of the Clause to the word 'school,' in line 17, inclusive, stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 232 ; Noes, 106. (Division List No. 432.)

Whereupon the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education [England and Wales] Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8 :—

Sir William Anson 1021

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 17, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'shall provide the school-house free of any charge, except for the teacher's dwelling-house if any, to the local education authority for use as a public elementary school, and.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Sydney Buxton 1023
Mr. Humphreys-Owen 1024

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the word 'school-house' to insert the words 'together with all buildings and all other hereditaments usually occupied or enjoyed therewith.' "—(*Mr. Humphreys-Owen.*)

Question proposed, "That those words stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Sir William Anson 1026
Sir James Rankin (Herefordshire, Leominster) 1027
Sir William Harcourt 1027

Sir Robert Finlay ... 1028
Dr. Macnamara ... 1030
Sir Francis Powell ... 1032
Sir William Harcourt ... 1033
Mr. Whitley ... 1034

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'except for the teacher's dwelling-house, if any.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Cripps (Lancashire, Stretford) ... 1035
Mr. M'Kenna ... 1035
Mr. Henry Hobhouse ... 1036
Mr. Perks (Lincolnshire, Louth) ... 1036
Col. Pilkington (Lancashire, Newton) ... 1037
Mr. Boyce ... 1037
Sir James Rankin ... 1038
Mr. Humphreys-Owen ... 1038
Sir Henry Fowler ... 1039
Mr. J. W. Wilson (Worcestershire, N.) ... 1039
Mr. Yoxall ... 1039
Mr Lloyd-George ... 1040
Sir Robert Finlay ... 1041

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 217; Noes, 111. (Division List. No. 433.)

Dr Macnamara ... 1045

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 2, after the word 'free' to insert the words 'for all educational purposes.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1047
Sir William Mather (Lancashire, Rossendale) ... 1048
Mr. Whitley ... 1048
Lord Hugh Cecil ... 1049
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1050
Sir Chas. Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) ... 1051
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice ... 1051
Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington) ... 1052
Mr. Whitley ... 1053
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1053

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

Oct. 29.] *Page*

"After the word 'school,' to insert the words 'and also for other educational purposes if the local education authority have no other suitable accommodation in providing schools, but not more often than three days a week.'"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Bryce 1054
Mr. Samuel Evans... 1054
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1054

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. Loyd (*Berkshire, Abingdon*) 1055

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 17, after the words 'out of,' to insert the words 'subscriptions, donations, income from endowment, or other.'"—(*Mr. A. K. Loyd.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Chas. Dilke 1056

Committee report Progress: to sit again To-morrow.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, 29TH OCTOBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Wick Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1057

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Norwich; Leicester; White Coppice; Diss; and Arbroath; to lie upon the Table 1057

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Hartlepools; Reading; Suffolk; and Hanwell; to lie upon the Table 1057

DUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: from Norwich; Leicester; Arbroath; Diss; and White Coppice; to lie upon the Table 1057

Oct. 29.] *Page*

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Edge Hill; St. Helens (two); Liverpool; Sheffield; and Kirkdale; to lie upon the Table 1057

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: from Norwich; Leicester; Diss; White Coppice; and Arbroath; to lie upon the Table 1057

VACCINATION BILL.—Petition from Croydon, in favour; to lie upon the table... 1057

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOCAL RECORDS COMMITTEE.—Copy presented, of Appendices to the Report of the Committee appointed to inquire as to the existing arrangements for the collection and custody of Local Records, and as to further measures which it may be advisable to take for the purpose [By Command]; to lie upon the Table 1057

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.—Copy presented, of Return showing the Unclaimed Shares of all Prize Money, Slave and Pirate Bounties, Salvage Awards, Parliamentary Grants, War Gratuities, and other Monies distributed by the Admiralty from the 1st day of January, 1855, to the 31st day of March, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1057

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

CIVIL SERVANTS' SUPERANNUATION COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1057

INDIAN LAND REVENUE—DEFAULT STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1059

INDIA—LAND UNDER CULTIVATION.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1059

POSTMEN—DISMISSALS: WAGES.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1059

CLONES POST OFFICE.—Question, Dr. Thompson (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1060

IRISH TRAVELLING POST OFFICES—RISK ALLOWANCES.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1060

RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Lord Cranborne 1061

EDUCATION BILL—DEFINITION OF "SECULAR"—Question, Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 1061

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER'S ANNUITY ACCOUNTS.—Question, Mr. Caldwell (Lancashire, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 1062

CLONMEL LAND APPEALS.—Question, Mr. Condon (Tipperary, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1062

HARD LABOUR SENTENCES—DISQUALIFICATIONS FOR MUNICIPAL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1063

Oct. 29.] *Page*

Barrow Drainage Works.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1063

Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork Co., Mid); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1063

Land Court Valuers and Sub-Commissioners.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork Co., N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1064

Closing of Irish Prisons.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1064

Lisburn Labourers' Cottages Scheme.—Question, Mr. Macartney (Antrim, W.) Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1065

Rae Estate, Kerry.—Question, Mr. O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1065

Historic Relics at Inishvickillane (Kerry).—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1065

Phthisis in Cornwall Mines.—Question, Mr. Caine (Cornwall, Camborne); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1066

Coal for the Navy—New Zealand Coal for the China Squadron.—Question, Mr. David Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1066

Remount Inquiry—Remuneration of Legal Assessor.—Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1067

Sentences of Military Courts in Cape Colony.—Question, Mr. Pirie; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1067

Archbishopric of Cyprus.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1068

Transvaal Mines—Mining Labour—Phthisis, etc,—Questions, Mr. Caine; Answers, Mr. J. Chamberlain 1068

Sierra Leone Railways.—Question, Mr. W. F. Lawrence (Liverpool, Abercrombie); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain... 1070

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Imports of Live Stock into the Transvaal.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.) 1071

Irregular Troops—Pension Grievances—Case of Mrs. MacKenzie.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1071

Civil Surgeons and War Honours.—Question, Mr. Soames (Norfolk, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1072

Height Standards for the Cavalry.—Question, Sir J. Dickson-Poynder (Wiltshire, Chippenham); Answer, Lord Stanley 1072

EMPLOYMENT FOR EX-SOLDIERS.—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Lord Stanley 1072

TIME-EXPIRED MEN.—Question, Major Rasch; Answer, Lord Stanley... ... 1073

CAPE GUARDAFUI LIGHTHOUSE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) ... 1073

PENRHYN QUARRY DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. David Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 1073

HOURS OF RAILWAY SERVANTS.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1074

COTTARS IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 1075

CROFTS IN ROSS-SHIRE AND THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1075

EDUCATION BILL—DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS' APPOINTMENTS.—Question, Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir Wm. Anson, Oxford University) 1076

SUGGESTED GOVERNMENT INSTRUCTIONS TO RESIDENT MAGISTRATES.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1076

SWORDS BOROUGH SCHOOL—CASE OF MICHAEL KEEGAN.—Question, Mr. Macartney (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1077

IRISH RAILWAY FACILITIES.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham... 1077

TREATMENT OF CRIMES ACT PRISONERS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1078

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACT — SKIBBEREEN APPLICATIONS. — Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1078

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. TULLY.

Mr. Tully 1079

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.); Answer, The Prime Minster and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1079

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair].

Clause 8—

Another Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, line 17, after the words 'out of,' to insert the words 'subscriptions, donations, income from endowment, or other.'"—(*Mr. A. K. Loyd.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*)... 1080
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1083
Mr. Edmund Robertson (*Dundee*)... 1085
Mr. Laurence Hardy (*Kent, Ashford*) 1085
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 1086
Mr. Bryce (*Aberdeen, S.*) 1087
Mr. Griffith Boscawen (*Kent, Tunbridge*) 1087
Mr. M'Kenna (*Monmouthshire, N.*) 1089
Mr. A. J. Balfour... 1089
Mr. Humphreys-Owen (*Montgomeryshire*)... 1089

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, line 18, to leave out the word 'them,' and insert the words 'foundation managers.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'them' stand part of the Clause."

The Attorney General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 1090
Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*) 1091
Mr. Levy (*Leicestershire, Loughborough*) 1091
Mr. Charles Morley (*Brecknock*) 1092
Dr. Macnamara 1092
Mr. Sydney Buxton (*Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) 1093
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs* 1093

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir Edward Strachey (*Somerset, E.*) ... ...

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, line 18, after the word 'then,' to insert the words 'insure against fire and.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay 1094
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*)... 1095

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Herbert Roberts (*Derbyshire, W.*) 1095

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, line 18, after the word 'them,' to insert the words 'discharge all liabilities incurred in connection with the school existing at the passing of the Act.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

The Secretary to the Board of Education, (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1096
Mr. Edmund Robertson 1097
Sir William Harcourt 1097
Mr. Pym (Bedford) 1098
Mr. Alfred Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) 1098
Mr. Lloyd-George 1098

Question put.

The Committee divided. Ayes, 113; Noes, 197. (Division List No. 434.)

Mr. Whitley 1101

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 18, after the word 'them,' to insert the words 'pay the caretaker.'"—(*Mr. Whitley*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1103
Mr. M'Kenna 1103

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.) 1103

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 18, after the word 'house,' to insert the words 'and all its educational appliances.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd Morgan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

M. Lloyd-George 1104
Mr. Sydney Buxton 1105
Sir Robert Finlay 1106
Mr Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) 1107
Sir John Dorington (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury)... 1107
Sir Robert Finlay 1108
Mr. Henry Hobhouse 1108
Mr. Wallace (Perth) 1108
Sir Robert Finlay 1109

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir John Dorington 1110

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 18, after the word 'good,' to insert the word 'structural.'"—(*Sir John Dorington.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'structural' be there inserted."

Oct. 29..] Page

Sir Robert Finlay ... 1110
Sir Charles Dilke ... 1110
Sir William Harcourt ... 1111
Sir James Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) ... 1111
Dr. Macnamara ... 1112
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) ... 1113
Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) ... 1114
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) ... 1114
Mr. M. White Ridley (Stalybridge) ... 1115
Mr. W. F. Lawrence (Liverpool, Abercromby) ... 1115
Mr. Bartley (Islington, N.) ... 1116
Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple) ... 1116
Mr. Cripps (Lancashire, Stretford) ... 1117
Sir Robert Finlay ... 1118
Mr. Talbot (Oxford University) ... 1118
Mr. Chas. M'Arthur (Liverpool, Exchange) ... 1118
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) ... 1120

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 35; Noes, 337. (Division List No. 435.)

Dr Macnamara ... 1123
Mr Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby) ... 1123

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 18, after the word 'repair,' to insert the words 'to the satisfaction of.'"—(*Mr. Corrie Grant.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay ... 1124

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr Herbert Roberts ... 1125

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 20, to leave out the word 'reasonably:'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'reasonably' stand part of the Clause."

Sir William Harcourt ... 1125
Sir Robert Finlay ... 1127
Mr. Herbert Lewis ... 1127
Mr. Sydney Buxton ... 1127
Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.) ... 1128

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 247; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 436.)

Mr. Alfred Hutton ... 1131

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 20, after the word 'authority,' to insert the words 'and if the managers are unable or unwilling to carry out these requirements, or fail to carry them out with due despatch, the local education authority shall have the right themselves to make such repairs, alterations, and improvements as are sanctioned by the Board of Education, and any school thereafter maintained in such buildings shall be held to be a school provided by that authority.'"—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted"

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1132
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid) 1133
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 1133
Mr. Lloyd-George 1134
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1135
Mr. Bryce 1136
Mr. Lawson Walton 1137
Mr. Samuel Evans 1138

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 101; Noes, 241. (Division List No. 437.)

It being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Piccadilly, City, and North-East London Railways Bill [Lords] (by Order).

Mr. Ashton (Bedfordshire, Luton.) 1141

Motion made and Question proposed—"That the Piccadilly, City, and North-East London Railways Bill [Lords] be re-committed to the former Committee."—(*Mr. Ashton.*)

Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) 1149
Sir J. Dickson-Poynder (Wiltshire, Chippenham) 1150
Mr. Perks (Lincolnshire, Louth) 1152
The Chairman of Committees (Mr. J. W. Lowther, Cumberland, Penrith) 1154
Mr. Bousfield (Hackney, N.) 1155
Sir Lewis M'Iver (Edinburgh, W.) 1155

Motion, by leave, withdrawn

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith), in the Chair.]

Oct. 29.] *Page*

Clause 8.

Mr. Whitley 1157

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 20, at end, insert, '(*e*) The local education authority shall have the right of removing any manager, who, at any time other than that allocated in the time-table of the school for religious instruction, shall question or instruct the scholars on any matter of religious doctrine or observance.'"—(*Mr. Whitley*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1158

Question put, and negatived.

Dr. Macnamara 1160

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 20, at the end, to insert the words 'the managers of a school not provided by the local education authority in respect of the use by them of the school furniture out of school hours, and the local education authority in respect of the use by them of any room in the school out of school hours, shall be liable to make good any damage caused to the furniture or the room, as the case may be, by reason of that use other damage arising from fair wear and tear, and the managers shall take care that after the use of a room in the school by them, the room is left in a proper condition for school purposes.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

M. M'Kenna 1161
Mr. Lough 1161
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1161
Mr. Lloyd-George 1162

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out from the first word 'authority' to the end of the proposed Amendment, and insert the words 'if they make use of any room in the school-house out of school-hours, shall be liable, if required, to make a reasonable payment to the local education authority in respect of wear and tear of, or damage to, any school furniture belonging to the local education authority resulting from that use, and shall take care that after any such use the room is left in a proper condition for school purposes.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*).

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Sir Robert Finlay 1164
Mr. Bryce 1165
Mr. Samuel Evans 1166
Mr. Pym 1167

Mr. A. J. Balfour rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question, 'That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 193; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 438.)

Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 198; Noes, 68. (Division List No. 439.)

Mr. A. J. Balfour claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the proposed words be there inserted' be now put."

Question put accordingly, "That the proposed words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 194; Noes, 65. (Division List No. 440.)

It being after Midnight, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Mr. A. J. Balfour claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the first word "The," in line 21, to the word "managers," in line 24, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the first word "The," in line 21, to the word "managers," in line 24, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 191; Noes, 64. (Division List 441.)

Question, "That the words of the Clause from the first word 'The,' in line 21, to the word 'managers,' in line 24, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause," put accordingly, and negatived.

The Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report progress; to sit again tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 30TH OCTOBER, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

Imprisonment of a Member.—Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a letter relating to the Imprisonment of a Member 1181

PETITIONS.

Canadian Cattle (Importation).—Petitions for abolition of restriction: from Bristol; Halstead; Braintree; Maldon; and Witham; to lie upon the Table 1181

Oct. 30.] *Page*

CHHIDI.—Petition from Cawnpore, for the release of Chhidi, a convict; to lie upon the Table 1181

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Liddlington; Houghton Conquest; Fivehead; and Bridgwater (four); to lie upon the Table 1181

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: from Braintree; Witham; Halstead; Maldon; and Bristol; to lie upon the Table 1181

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions in favour: from Liverpool; and St. Helens; to lie upon the Table 1181

JAMMADAS, JOSHI.—Petition of the widow of Joshi Jammadas, for the redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table 1182

KOOSAJI.—Petitions of Sampat, son of Koosaji, for redress of grievance; to lie upon the Table 1182

PADAYACHI VEERABADRA.—Petition of Veerabadra Padayachi, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table 1182

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE (EXTENSION TO WOMEN) BILL.—Petition from North Brierly, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1182

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation; from Bristol; Witham; Halstead; Braintree; and Maldon; to lie upon the Table 1182

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SUPERANNUATION.—Copy ordered, "of Treasury Minute, dated the 24th day of June, 1902, as to the pension to be awarded to Mr. G. R. Price, Registrar in the Chancery Division of the Supreme Court of Judicature, Ireland, on his retirement."—(*Mr. Hayes Fisher*) 1182

LOCAL RECORDS COMMITTEE.—Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed to inquire as to the existing arrangements for the collection and custody of local records, and as to further measures which it may be advisable to take for the purpose [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1182

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of statement under administrative counties and county boroughs of public elementary schools which have received building grants, showing in each case the amount of such building grants, and the amount subscribed by the promoters at the time (so far as records exist); also, in the case of schools which have been transferred to the School Board or closed, the year of transfer or closure, with explanatory memorandum and appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 1182

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of precedents of trust deeds settled for Church of England Schools, British Schools, Established Church of Scotland Schools, Wesleyan Schools, Free Church (Scotland) Schools, Roman Catholic Schools, Jewish Schools, Episcopal Church (Scotland) Schools, and Undenominational Schools referred to in the Revised Code of 1870 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1183

SHIPS COMMISSIONED (CHATHAM, PORTSMOUTH, AND DEVONPORT).—Return presented relative thereto, [ordered 24 July; Mr. Reginald Lucas]; to lie upon the Table; and to be printed [No. 363] 1183

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

INDIA—SPECIAL IRRIGATION GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1183

CHINA OPERATIONS, 1900—SALE OF SURPLUS STORES OF RUM.—Question, Mr. Caine (Cornwall, Camborne); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1183

ARMY MEDICAL CORPS IN INDIA—PAY.—Question, Dr. Thompson (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Lord George Hamilton... 1184

PROPOSED FISHING HARBOUR AT SWORDLE, LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Graham Murray 1184

EVENING CONTINUATION CLASSES GRANTS.—Question, Sir Mark Stewart (Kirkcudbrightshire); Answer, Mr. Graham Murray 1184

EMPLOYMENT IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS OF DISCHARGED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 1185

EDUCATION BILL—SCHOOL TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION.—Question, Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Sir William Anson 1185

NATIONAL SOCIETY'S SCHOOLS.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 1186

BUSHEY PARK.—Question, Mr. Labouchere (Northampton); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 1186

IRISH POSTMASTERSHIPS—APPOINTMENT OF ENGLISHMEN AND SCOTCHMEN.—Question, Dr. Thompson; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1187

KILMALLOCK (LIMERICK) LABOURERS' COTTAGES SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1187

EMPLOYMENT OF DISCHARGED SOLDIERS.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1188

CONTRACTS FOR CANTEENS.—Question, Mr. Mount (Berkshire, Newbury); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1188

VOLUNTEER AND MILITIA STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1189

SOUTH AFRICA—OUTFIT ALLOWANCES TO MILITIA OFFICERS.—Question, Major Rasch; Answer, Mr. Brodrick... 1189

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SETTLEMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1189

SOMALILAND.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 1190

ROYAL NAVAL RESERVE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) ... 1190

Nov. 16.] Page

CRUISERS TO COPE WITH FOREIGN ARMOURED COMMERCE DESTROYERS.—Questions, Captain Norton (Newington, W.), Sir Wm. Allan (Gateshead), and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster ... 1190

GERMAN LOCOMOTIVES FOR INDIAN RAILWAYS.—Questions, Colonel Denny (Kilmarnock Burghs), and Sir William Allan; Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing)... 1191

CHRISTIANIA FISHERY CONFERENCE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Lord Cranborne 1192

HONG KONG CABLE.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) ... 1192

BOER GENERALS AT CAMBRIDGE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1193

VENTILATION OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Question, Mr. Wylie (Dumbartonshire); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Hunts, Ramsey) 1194

DUBLIN CUSTOM HOUSE.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1194

CRIMES ACT PRISONERS IN SLIGO GAOL.—Question, Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1195

ROYAL PATRIOTIC COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Kearley (Devonport); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1196

VOLUNTARY SCHOOL TRUST DEEDS RETURN.—Questions, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee), Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1196

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1197

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W. R., Elland*) 1198

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, after the words last inserted, to insert the words, '(*f*) The managers of the school shall allow any room in the school to be used, at any time when the school is not being used for public education, for any meeting held in connection with a political, municipal, or local election; and if, by reason of such use of the room, any expenditure is incurred by the managers, or any damage is done to the room, or to any furniture or apparatus in the room, such expense or damage shall be reimbursed to the managers by the persons by whom, or on whose behalf, the meeting was convened.'"—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) ... 1200
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) ... 1201
Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, S.) ... 1203
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) ... 1204
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) ... 1206
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) ... 1207
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) ... 1207
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) ... 1207
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) ... 1208
Mr. Nussey (Pontefract) ... 1209
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1210
Mr. Bryce ... 1211
Mr. Courtney Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) ... 1212

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question, 'That those words be there inserted,' be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 187 ; Noes, 85. (Division List, No. 442.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 91 ; Noes, 189. (Division List, No. 443.)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR claimed to move, "That the Question, 'That the word "If" in line 25, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the word "If," in line 25, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 211 ; Noes, 86. (Division List, No. 444.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 218 ; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 445.)

Mr. Bryce ... 1225

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 25, to leave out the words from the word 'If,' to the end of line 29, and insert the words 'the managers of any school fail to comply with the above conditions no assistance from the rates or the Parliamentary grant shall be given to such school.' "—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'any question,' stand part of the Clause."

The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) ... 1229
Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton) ... 1233
Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.) ... 1235
Mr. Broadhurst (Leicester) ... 1236
Mr. Sydney Buxton ... 1237

Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid.) 1238
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 1241
Mr. Beckett (Yorkshire N.R., Morley) 1243
Sir Edward Grey 1243
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 1243
Sir Charles Dilke 1245
Sir Robert Finlay 1246
Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) 1246
Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) 1246
Mr. Butcher (York) 1247
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 1248

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words "any question" stand part of the Clause' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 239; Noes, 100. (Division List No. 446.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 243; Noes, 102. (Division List No. 447.)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the word "arises," in line 25, to the word "grant," in line 29, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the word "arises," in line 25, to the word "grant," in line 29, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 232; Noes, 100. (Division List No. 448.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 232; Noes, 98. (Division List No. 449.)

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

Sir Edward Grey 1263

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 29, after the word 'grant,' to insert the words 'and in the event of failure on the part of the managers to comply with any of the conditions of this section, the local education authority shall have power, subject to fair compensation to the owners, to acquire or rent the building and treat it as a school provided by them.'"—*Sir Edward Grey.*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1265
Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.) ... 1268
Mr. Cripps, (Lancashire, Stretford) ... 1271
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) ... 1271
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1272
Mr. Courtenay Warner ... 1275

Question proposed.

Committee divided:—Ayes, 85; Noes, 176. (Division List, No. 450.)

Sir William Anson ... 1277

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 29, at the end, to insert the words, '(3) In any case in which there are more candidates for the post of pupil teacher than there are places to be filled the appointment shall be made by the local education authority, and they shall determine the respective qualifications of the candidates by examination or otherwise.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs) ... 1278

Amendment proposed to the Amendment—

"In line 1 to leave out from the beginning to the word 'the' in line 2."—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

Mr. Whitley ... 1284

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the first word 'of' to insert the words "assistant and.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1285
Mr. Bryce ... 1287
Mr. Samuel Evans ... 1289
Mr. Trevelyan ... 1290
Mr. Lucas (Portsmouth) ... 1291
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1293
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) ... 1297
Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs) ... 1293

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 85; Noes, 197. (Division List No. 451.)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Col. Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) ... 1303

Committee report Progress: to sit again Tomorrow.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Preamble.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this be the Preamble of the Bill."

Committee report Progress: to sit again Tomorrow. 1304

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 31ST OCTOBER, 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

ADJOURNMENT.—Resolved, That this House, at the rising of the House this day, do adjourn till Monday next.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*) 1305

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION.)—Petitions for abolition of restrictions from Tantobie; Port Glasgow; Surbiton; Mansfield; and East Kirkby; to lie upon the Table 1305

CLUBS REGISTRATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Baptist Union of Scotland, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1305

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Hull; and Ashwater; to lie upon the Table 1305

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: from Tantobie; Honley; Surbiton; Mansfield: Kirkby-in-Ashfield; and Edinburgh; to lie upon the Table 1305

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petition from Ashton-in-Makerfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1305

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petitions for legislation: from Tantobie; Honley; Surbiton; and Mansfield; to lie upon the Table ... 1305

SOUTH AFRICA (BRITISH INDIAN SUBJECTS IN THE TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY).—Petition from London, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table 1305

SUNDAY TRADING (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition of the Baptist Union of Scotland, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1305

DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND *v.* ANDERSON AND OTHERS.—Petition of Charles Gibbons May, Solicitor, of 49, Lincoln's Inn Fields, praying for leave for the proper officer to attend at the High Court of Justice, and produce documents.
Leave given to the proper officer to attend accordingly.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) ... 1305

Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

POLICE (METROPOLIS.)—Copy presented, of Report of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis for the year 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1306

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).—Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 30th September, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1306

SUPERANNUATION.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 30th October; Mr. Hayes Fisher]; to lie upon the Table.

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.

CHARITABLE ENDOWMENTS (LONDON).—Further return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August, 1894; Mr. Francis Stevenson]; to be printed. [No. 364.] ... 1306

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

MILITARY HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION AT SHORNCLIFFE.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1306

RATING OF CROWN PROPERTY.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, Mr. Hayes Fisher 1307

LONDON POSTAL SORTERS' GRIEVANCES.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1309

RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Lord Cranborne 1309

VACCINATION PROSECUTIONS AT BETHNAL GREEN.—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas ... 1310

EDUCATION BILL—PUPIL TEACHERSHIP.—Question Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answer, Sir William Anson 1310

IRISH PHARMACEUTICAL SOCIETY.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1311

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8—

Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (*Shropshire, Newport*) 1311

Amendment proposed—

"After the words last inserted, to insert the words, 'Religious instruction shall be given in a school not provided by the local education authority, in accordance with the tenour of the provisions (if any) of the trust deed relating thereto, and shall be under the control of the managers.'"—*Colonel Kenyon-Slaney.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Secretary of the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) ... 1316
Mr. Vicary Gibbs (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) ... 1318
Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) ... 1319
Mr. Griffith Boscawen (Kent, Tonbridge) ... 1320
Lord Edmund Talbot (Sussex, Chichester) ... 1323
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) ... 1325
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) ... 1330
Colonel Nolan (Galway, N.) ... 1336
Mr. Laurence Hardy (Kent, Ashford) ... 1337
Sir James Fergusson (Manchester, N.E. ... 1341
Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.) ... 1343
Major Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford) ... 1345
Sir John Kennaway (Devonshire, Honiton) ... 1346
Mr. Goulding (Wiltshire, Devizes) ... 1347
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) ... 1348
Mr. Cripps (Lancashire, Stretford) ... 1349
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1349
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) ... 1353
Mr. Griffith Boscawen ... 1354

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 1, after 'a,' to insert 'public elementary.'"—(*Mr. Griffith Boscawen.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment," put and agreed to.

Lord Hugh Cecil ... 1354

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 3, after 'and,' to insert 'subject to those provisions.'"—(*Lord Hugh Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1355
Sir William Harcourt ... 1355
Mr. Pemberton (Sunderland) ... 1356

Question put, and negatived.

Sir James Fergusson ... 1356

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"At the end of line 3, to insert the word 'foundation.'"—(*Sir James Fergusson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'foundation' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.) 1357
Lord Hugh Cecil 1358

Question put, and negatived.

Question put, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 211; Noes, 41. (Division List No. 452.)

Sir William Anson 1361

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 30, to leave out sub-Section (3)."—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That sub-Section (3) stand part of the Clause."

Question put and negatived.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) 1363
Sir William Harcourt 1364
Mr. Lloyd-George 1365
Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 1366

Mr. A. J. Balfour rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question, 'That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 166; Noes, 72. (Division List No. 453.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 165; Noes, 69. (Division List No. 454.)

It being after half-past Five of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter before Six of the Clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 3rd NOVEMBER, 1902.

Sat First.—The Lord Braybrooke sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother; The Lord Cheylesmore sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother 1373

Nov. 3.] *Page*

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill (No. 182); Dumbarton Corporation (Further Powers) Order Confirmation Bill (No. 183); Wick Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill (No. 184).—Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}, to be printed, and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2^{a} and reported from the Committee 1373

Richmond Hill (Preservation of View) Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1373

South-Eastern and London, Chatham and Dover Railways Bill [H.L.]; Returned from the Commons with the Amendments made by the Lords to the Amendments made by the Commons, agreed to 1373

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill [H.L.]; Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway (Nos. 1 and 3) Bill [H.L.], and Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway (No. 2) Bill [H.L.], now Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill [H.L.], Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill [H.L.], North-west London Railway Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1373

Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway (New Lines, Etc.,) Bill [H.L.]; Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1374

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the following Papers having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI., viz. ... 1374

ARMY (REMOUNTS).—

I. Minutes of evidence taken before the Court of Enquiry on the administration of the Army Remount Department; with appendices. (October 17.)

II. Reports of Officers appointed by the Commander-in-Chief to inquire into the working of the Remount Department abroad. (October 17) ... 1374

NAVY (COURTS-MARTIAL).—Returns of the number of courts-martial held, and summary punishments inflicted, during the year 1901. (October 18) ... 1374

MINES AND QUARRIES (GENERAL REPORT AND STATISTICS FOR 1901) (PART III., OUTPUT).—General Report and Statistics relating to the output and value of the minerals raised in the United Kingdom, the amount and value of the metals produced, and the exports and imports of minerals. (October 18) 1374

CHINA, No. 2 (1902).—Despatch from His Majesty's Special Commissioner, enclosing the treaty between Great Britain and China, signed at Shanghai, 5th September, 1902. (October 21) 1374

CROFTER HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS, 1886–87.—Report to the Secretary for Scotland by the Crofters Commission on the social condition of the people of Lewis in 1901. (October 23) 1374

Nov. 3.] *Page*

STATISTICS (COLONIES).—

I. Tables relating to the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom, Part XXV., for the year 1900. (October 24)

II. Abstract for the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1887 to 1901. Thirty-ninth number. (October 24) 1374

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).—Return for the month of August, 1902. (October 24) 1375

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 2907. China (Nanking). (October 18.)
No. 2908. Japan (South Formosa). (Supplementary). (October 24.)
No. 2909. United States (Cuba). (October 24.)
No. 2910. Italy (Ancona). October 24. 1375

IRELAND (TYPHOID FEVER IN LIMERICK CITY AND PRISON, JULY, AUGUST, AND SEPTEMBER, 1902.—Reports made by Stewart Wodehouse, Esq., M.D., Medical Member of the General Prisons Board for Ireland, and by Sir J. Acheson MacCullagh, M.D., Medical Inspector to the Local Government Board for Ireland. (October 24.) 1375

AFRICA, NO. 4 (1902).—Report by the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway Committee on the Progress of the Works, 1901-1902; with two maps and section. (October 27.)... 1375

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

I. Rules to be observed in planning and fitting up public elementary schools. (October 28).

II. Precedents of trust deeds settled for Church of England schools, British schools, Established Church of Scotland schools, Wesleyan schools, Free Church (Scotland) schools, Roman Catholic schools, Jewish schools, Episcopal Church (Scotland) schools, and undenominational schools referred to in the Revised Code of 1870. (October 30.)

III. Statement under administrative counties and county boroughs of public elementary schools which have received building grants, showing, in each case, the amount of such building grants and the amount subscribed by the promoters at the time (so far as records exist); also, in the case of schools which have been transferred to the School Board or closed, the year of transfer or closure; with explanatory memorandum and appendix. (October 31.) 1375

COLONIES (ANNUAL).—No. 369. Hong Kong (1901). (October 28.) 1376

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1902.—Conference between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Prime Ministers of the Self-governing colonies, June to August, 1902. (October 28.) 1376

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.—Return showing the unclaimed shares of all prize money, slave and pirate bounties, salvage awards, Parliamentary grants, war gratuities, and other monies distributed by the Admiralty, from the 1st January, 1855, to 31st March, 1902. (October 30.) 1376

Nov. 3.] *Page*

POLICE (METROPOLIS).—Report of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, for the year 1901. (October 31.) 1376

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.—Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 30th September, 1902. (November 1.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1376

COLONIES (ANNUAL).--No. 370. Cocos Islands, 1902. 1376

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).—Return for the month of September, 1902. 1376

RAILWAYS (CONTINUOUS BRAKES).—Return by the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom, for six months ended the 30th June, 1902. 1376

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

I. Thirtieth Annual Report, 1900–1901. Supplement containing Report of the Medical Officer for 1900–1901 on Lead Poisoning and Water Supplies.

II. Thirty-first Annual Report, 1901–1902. Supplement containing Report of the Medical Officer for 1901–1902. 1376

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES..—Area, houses and population, also population classified by ages, condition as to maraiage, occupations, birthplaces, and infirmities for counties of—Suffolk; Leicester; Somerset. Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.... 1377

WINTER ASSIZES ACTS, 1876–1877.—Seven Orders in Council of 11th August, 1902, relating to the ensuing winter assizes. 1377

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Five Orders in Council of 11th August, 1902, entitled respectively—

The Cyprus Courts of Justice Amendment Order, 1902;
The Uganda Order in Council, 1902;
The British Central Africa Order in Council, 1902;
The East Africa Order in Council, 1902; and
The Eastern African Protectorates (Court of Appeal) Order in Council, 1902. 1377

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.—Two Orders in Council of 11th August, 1902, approving Pilotage Bye-laws for the ports of Cardiff and Waterford respectively 1377

EXTRADITION ACTS, 1870–1895.—Order in Council of 15th September, 1902, giving effect to a Declaration, signed 25th June, 1901, supplementary to the Extradition Treaty of 3rd December, 1873, between Great Britain and Austria-Hungary. 1377

INEBRIATES ACTS, 1879–1899 (INEBRIATES COMMITTED UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE LICENSING ACT, 1902).—Regulations made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department by virtue of Section 20 of the Inebriates Act, 1898, for carrying into effect the provisions of Section 5 of the Licensing Act, 1902, respecting the detention of inebriates committed to retreats : 1377

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACT, 1894 AND 1896.—Two Orders, dated the 1st day of September, 1902, entitled the Bristol (Cumberland and Tidal Basin) Foreign Animals Wharf Revocation Order of 1902, and the Bristol (Cumberland Basin) Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1902 1377

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1899.—Minutes sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Technical Instruction Act, 1889, for the counties of: Huntingdon (second minute); East Suffolk (seventh minute); Leicester (seventh minute); Oxford (eighth minute); Southampton (tenth minute). Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie upon the Table 1378

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877.—Statute made by the University of Cambridge, and sealed on the 27th May, 1902, amending the statutes of the University. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 179.) 1378

MARGATE PIER AND HARBOUR COMPANY (1812).—Report and Statement of Accounts for the year ended 5th April, 1902. Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie upon the Table 1378

Patent Law Amendment Bill (No. 180); Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill (No. 181).—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and to be printed 1378

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—*The Lord President of the Council* (*The Duke of Devonshire*) *moved*:—That the House on its rising stand adjourned till Monday next.—(*The Duke of Devonshire.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, Monday, 3rd November, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Water Provisional Order Bill.—Reported with an Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered tomorrow 1379

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).—Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Dumbarton; and St. Ives; to lie upon the Table 1379

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: from Dumbarton; and St. Ives; to lie upon the Table 1379

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions from St. Aidans, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1379

MERCHANT SHIPPING (LIGHTHOUSES) BILL.—Petition from Cardiff, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1379

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.—Petition for legislation: from Edinburgh; Dumbarton; and St. Ives; to lie upon the Table 1379

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).—Copy presented, of Returns of Proceedings during the month of September, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1380

Railways (Continuous Brakes).—Copy presented, of Return by the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom on the progress made in the use of Continuous Brakes, etc., for the six months ending 30th June, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1380

Mercantile Marine (Seamen Employed).—Copy presented, of Return of the number, ages, ratings, and nationalities of the seamen employed on the 31st March, 1901, on vessels registered under Part I. of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, in the British Islands [by Command]; to lie upon the Table ... 1380

Civil Services (Additional Estimate, 1902–1903).—Estimate presented, of the amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1903, as a Grant-in-Aid to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony for Expenses consequent upon the termination of the War [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 365.] 1380

Local Government Board.—Copy presented, of Supplement to the Thirtieth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1900-1901, in continuation of the Report of the Medical Officer for 1900-1901, on Lead Poisoning and Water Supplies [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1380

Local Government Board.—Copy presented, of Supplement to the Thirty-first Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1901-1902, containing the Report of the Medical Officer for 1901-1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1380

Census (England and Wales), 1901.—Copy presented, of Census of England and Wales, 1901 (Counties of Suffolk, Leicester, and Somerset) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1380

Colonial Reports (Annual).—Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 370 (Cocos Islands, Annual Report for 1902) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1380

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Aird (Stornaway) School Playground.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1381

Lewis Local Government Board Inquiry.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1381

Standard of Ventilation for Cotton Weaving Sheds.—Question, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1382

Indian Railway Contracts with German Firms.—Question, Colonel Denny (Kilmarnock Burghs); Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1382

Navy Contracts—Preserves.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Arnold Forster 1382

Naval Shipbuilding—Designs of Scouts.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1383

Fatal Gun Accident at Portsmouth.—Question, Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1883

ATHLONE INCOME TAX APPEALS.—Question, Mr. Kennedy (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Ritchie … … … … … … .. … 1384

RAILWAY CARRIAGE OF INFLAMMABLE LIQUIDS.—Question, Mr. Scott Montague (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour … … … 1384

LURGAN POST OFFICE.—Question, Col. Saunderson (Armagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain … … … … … … … … 1385

LONDON POST OFFICE—HOLIDAY ALLOWANCES.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain … … … 1385

POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS WITH THE UNITED STATES.—Question, Mr. Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain … … … 1385

ENNISKILLEN POSTAL STAFF'S GRIEVANCES.—Question, Dr. Thompson (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain … … … … 1386

DUBLIN—MULLINGAR RAILWAY RATES.—Question, Mr. Kennedy (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham … … … … … … … 1387

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—TRANSPORT—OVERCROWDING ON THE "DRAYTON GRANGE."—Question, Mr. H. C. Richards (Finsbury, E.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick… … … … … … … … … … 1387

VOLUNTEER ARTILLERY ARMAMENTS.—Question, Mr. Loder (Brighton); Answer, Mr. Brodrick … … … … … … … … … 1388

HONG KONG BUILDING ORDINANCES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain … … … … … … … … … 1388

WEST AFRICA—IMPORTATION OF OVER PROOF SPIRITS.—Question, Col. Welby (Taunton); Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain … … … … … 1389

NORTH NIGERIA—IMPORTATION OF LIQUORS.—Question, Col. Welby; Answer, Mr. J. Chamberlain … … .. … … … … … 1389

TAXATION OF PERSONAL PROPERTY—FOREIGN AND COLONIAL SYSTEMS.—Question, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour … … … … … … … … … … 1390

SPALDING GRAMMAR SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answer, Sir William Anson … … … … … … … 1390

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

COMPENSATION TO BOERS FOR WAR LOSSES.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) … … … … … … 1391

ARMY COMMISSIONS—AGE REGULATIONS.—Question, Colonel Bain (Cumberland, Egremont); Answer, Lord Stanley … … … … … … 1391

NEW CUNARDERS.—Questions, Sir William Allan (Gateshead); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) … … 1392

MADRAS RAILWAY—PREFERENCE FOR GERMAN STEAMSHIP OWNERS.—Question, Mr. Norman (Wolverhampton, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) … … … … 1392

Nov. 3.] *Page*

DELAGOA BAY.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Cranborne, Rochester) 1394

APPROPRIATION OF SUPPLY—TERMINAL CHARGES FOR SOUTH AFRICA.—Questions, Mr. M'Crae (Edinburgh, E.) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Michael Hicks Beach, Bristol, W.) 1394

MAYORAL SILVER CORONATION MEDALS.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1395

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—HARTLEPOOL COUNTY COURT MEDICAL REFEREE.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas ... 1395

ABERTYSSWG MINERS' GALLANTRY.—Questions, Sir Chas. M'Laren (Leicestershire, Bosworth) and Mr. William Abraham (Glamorganshire, Rhondda); Answers, Mr. Akers Douglas 1396

CANADIAN STORE CATTLE—RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTATION.—Questions, Sir John Leng and Mr. Archdale (Fermanagh, N.); Answers, The President of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Hanbury, Preston) 1397

HOUSE SITES FOR SHETLAND CROFTERS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 1398

SCOTTISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD—EXPENDITURE ON NEW HOLDINGS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1398

SCOTTISH FISHERMEN AND THE THREE MILE LIMIT.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1399

CONGESTION IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1399

PORTNESS HARBOUR, ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1400

CONSIGNMENT OF ARMS TO IRELAND—CIRCULAR TO BIRMINGHAM MANUFACTURERS.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.) and Mr. Tully (Leitrim, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1400

IRISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD—PURCHASES OF LANDS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1401

MOHILL RURAL DISTRICT FINANCE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1401

CORK EXHIBITION—THE CHIEF SECRETARY'S VISIT.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1401

WESTPORT RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL AND THE LAND QUESTION.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1402

SUIR BRIDGE TOLLS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1402

CRIME IN CAVAN AND LEITRIM.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1403

IRISH POOR LAW AUDITS.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham ... 1403

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1403

UNLAWFUL ASSEMBLIES IN BELFAST.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1404

MARTELLO TOWER AT BRIGHTON VALE.—Question, Mr. Tully; Answer, Lord Stanley 1404

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.—Questions, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.), Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.), and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1404

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Bryce, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean), Mr. Lough, Mr. Gibson Bowles, Mr. Bartley (Islington, N.), Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy, Burghs), and Mr. Tully; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour and Mr. Ritchie 1405

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.—Ordered, That the several Accounts and Papers which have been presented to the House in this Session of Parliament relating to the Revenues of India be referred to the consideration of a Committee of the whole House.—(*Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*)

Resolved, That this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into the said Committee.—(*Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) 1407

Osborne Estate Bill.—Bill, "to make provision with respect to the disposition and management of His Majesty's Osborne Estate, in the Isle of Wight," presented by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, under Standing Order No. 31; to be read a second time upon Monday next and to be printed. [Bill 301.] 1407

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith), in the Chair.]

Clause 9 :—

Mr. M'Kenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 1408

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Clause 9 be postponed."—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1409
Mr. Lloyd George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 1409
Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea District) 1410

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 64 ; Noes, 115. (Division List, No. 455.)

Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 1413
Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) 1415

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 36, to leave out the words, 'the local education authority or any other,' and insert the word 'any.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the local education authority' stand part of the Clause."

The Attorney General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 1417
Mr. Herbert Lewis (Flint Boroughs) 1418

Question proposed.

Committee divided :—Ayes, 145 ; Noes, 87. (Division List, No. 456.)

Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W. R., Elland) 1421

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 36, to leave out the words, 'or any other persons.'"—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1424
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen S.) 1426
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 1432
Dr. Macnamara 1434
Mr. Bartley (Islington, N.)... 1438
Mr. Robson (South Shields)... 1439
Mr. Herbert Robertson (Hackney, S.) 1441
Mr. Lloyd-George 1442
Mr. Middlemore (Birmingham, N.) 1446
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) 1448
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1449
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 1451
Sir William Mather (Lancashire, Rossendale) 1452
Mr. Perks (Lincolnshire, Louth) 1452
Mr. M'Kenna 1454
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 1455

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 225 ; Noes, 111. (Division List No. 457.)

Dr. Macnamara 1459

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 37, after 'school,' insert 'or to enlarge any existing public elementary school,'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Robert Finlay 1459
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 1460
Mr. Sydney Buxton (*Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) 1460
Dr. Macnamara 1461
Mr. M'Kenna 1461

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the word "propose," in page 3, line 37, to the word "school," in line 40, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the word "propose" in page 3, line 37, to the word "school," in line 40, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 222; Noes, 107. (Division List No. 458.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 222; Noes, 107. (Division List No. 459.)

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 9 :—

Mr. Herbert Roberts 1469

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 40, to leave out the words 'and any ten ratepayers in the area for which it is proposed to provide the school.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'and' stand part of the Clause."

The Secretary to the Board of Education (*Sir William Anson, Oxford University*) 1470
Mr. Bousfield (*Hackney, N.*) 1470

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 87; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 460.)

Mr. M'Kenna 1471

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 1, to leave out the words 'any ten,' and insert the words 'a majority of the.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'any ten' stand part of the Clause."

Page

Sir Robert Finlay ... 1472
Mr. Fletcher Moulton (*Cornwall, Launceston*) ... 1473
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1474
Dr. Macnamara ... 1475
Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) ... 1475
Mr. Herbert Lewis ... 1476
Mr. Charles McArthur (*Liverpool Exchange*) ... 1476
Mr. Bryce ... 1477
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) ... 1477
Mr. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) ... 1478

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 176; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 461.)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'that the words of the Clause from the word "ratepayers" in page 4, line 1, to the word "required," in line 4, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the word "ratepayers," in page 4, line 1, to the word "required," in line 4, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 184; Noes, 98. (Division List No. 462.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 188; Noes, 100. (Division List, No. 463.)

Dr. Macnamara ... 1487

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 4, to leave out from the word 'required' to the word 'and,' in line 6, and insert the words 'to meet any deficiencies in school places.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, That the words 'or that' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1488
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) ... 1489
Mr. Fletcher Moulton ... 1490
Lord Hugh Cecil (*Greenwich*) ... 1495
Mr. Trevelyan ... 1496
Mr. Lough ... 1497
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1497
Sir Wm. Allan (*Gateshead*) ... 1492

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 187; Noes, 88. (Division List, No. 464.)

Question put accordingly, "That the words 'or that' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 183; Noes, 82. (Division List, No. 465.)

It being after Midnight, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the business.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the Clause stand part of the Bill' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the Clause stand part of the Bill' be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 181 ; Noes, 81. (Division List, No. 466.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 176 ; Noes, 78. (Division List, No. 467.)

The CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again Tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CXIII.

ERRATUM.

The Speech of Sir William Anson on 28th October, reported on page 979, should read as follows :—

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that after long discussion on small matters he was glad that they had now come to an Amendment which was of a serious character, and which would affect the admitted grievance of Nonconformists as regarded their admission to the teaching staffs of denominational schools. They desired on this particular matter to secure that religious and secular teaching should not be divorced, that consideration should be allowed to those who had given land and money, and time and trouble, to maintain the denominational character of schools, and that at the same time the appointments to teachers' places should be thrown open as widely as possible. This Amendment would go a long way to satisfy those requirements. It was an enabling Amendment and put no compulsion upon the managers of the schools to choose from one or any denomination or from no denomination at all, but it did untie their hands where the trustees had tied them hitherto, except in respect of the appointment of the head teacher. He wished to ask, had the denomination any cause for anxiety in the admission of assistant teachers and pupil teachers of other denominations ? He could not think there was any such cause of anxiety. It ought to lie near the conscience of every teacher that, as a matter of honour, they should impress or impart no religious or political prepossessions of their own, and take no advantage in influencing the religious or political beliefs of the children. He had not much fear of any proselytising tendency in any part of our system of elementary education. Then there was the power of dismissal on grounds connected with religious instruction. If a Nonconformist teacher was imported into a church school, and taught religious subjects with levity, or showed any desire to affect the religious beliefs of the children, the managers would have the power of dismissal, against which decision the local authority would have nothing to say. Beyond this, they could not help feeling that in the interests of the denominational schools it was important that the head teacher, who gave the character to the teaching of the school, should be a member of the denomination to which the school belonged, if the trust deed required it. If the trust deed required that the assistant teachers should be members of any particular denomination, then the managers could appoint, under this Amendment, teachers from any denomination they liked. The Government did not think that any harm would come from such a relaxation as his hon. friend proposed by his Amendment, and therefore, on behalf of the Government, he was prepared to accept it.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION)

IN THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, IN THE
SECOND YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

THIRTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 16*th October*, 1902.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the following Papers having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI. viz.—

TRADE REPORTS—I. ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 2875. West Africa (Liberia). (August 13).

No. 2876. France (French Guiana). (August 13.)

No. 2877. France (Society Islands). (August 13.)

No. 2878. Japan (Shimonoski and Maji). (August 14.)

No. 2879. Sweden (Gothenburg). August 16.)

No. 2880. Portugal (Quilimane). August 16.)

No. 2881. France (Algeria). (August 16.)

No. 2882. Finances of Netherlands. (August 19.)

No. 2883. Netherlands (Dutch Guinea). (Augsut 21.)

No. 2884. Turkey (Baghdad). (August 21.)

No. 2885. Chile. (August 26.)

No. 2886. Paraguay. (August 26.)

No. 2887. Italy (Sicily). (August 27.)

No. 2888. Brazil (Bahia and Sergipe). (August 27.)

2889. United States (Philippine Islands). (August 28).

No. 2890. Portugal (Oporto). (August 28.)

No. 2891. France (New Caledonia). (August 28.)

No. 2892. Germany (Dantzig). (August 29.)

No. 2893. Zanzibar. (September 8.)

No. 2894. United States. (September 8.)

No. 2895. Austria-Hungary (Fiume). (September 8.)

No. 2896. Italy (Rome and District). (September 10.)

No. 2897. Russia (Finland). (September 10.)

No. 2898. Siam (Bangkok). (September 10.)

No. 2899. Japan (Nagasaki). (September 10.)

No. 2900. Japan (Hakodate). September 10.)

No. 2901. Belgium. (September 16.)

No. 2902. Netherlands (Curacoa and Dependencies). (September 20.)

No. 2903. Africa (East Africa Protectorate). (September 25.)

No. 2904. Russia (Odessa). (September 25).

No. 2905. China (Kiungchow). (October 3).

No. 2906. China (Ichang). (October 11.)

II. MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 580. United States: Coal Industry of the Consular District of Chicago. (September 20.)

No. 581. United States: Report on the Cattle and Meat Trade. (October 10.)

No. 582. France: Chemical and Metal Industries of Lyons District. (October 10).

No. 583. United States: Report on the Iron Ore Industry. (October 11).

COLONIES—I. ANNUAL REPORTS.

No. 359. Gibraltar, 1901. (August 13.)

No. 360. Straits Settlements, 1901. (September 2.)

No. 361. Sierra Leone, 1901. (September 5.)

No. 362. British Honduras, 1901. (September 8.)

No. 363. Turks and Caicos Islands, 1901. (September 8.)

No. 364. Seychelles, 1901. (September 26.)

No. 365. Bahamas, 1901; with Report on Salt Industry of Inagua. (September 27.)

No. 366. Fiji, 1901. (October 3.)

No. 367. Ceylon, 1901. (October 10.)

No. 368. Barbados, 1901. (October 14.)

II. MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS.

No. 20. Wei-Hai-Wei. (September 2.)

No. 21. Dominica. (October 10.)

PATRIOTIC FUND.

Fortieth Report of the Royal Commissioners. (August 14.)

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Abstracts showing the acreage under crops and the number of live stock in each county and province, 1901–1902. (August 18.)

LUNACY (IRELAND).

Fifty-first Report with appendices of the Inspectors of Lunatics in Ireland, for the year 1901. (August 18.)

FISHERIES (IRELAND).

Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the sea and inland fisheries of Ireland, for the year 1901. Part I. General Report. (August 18.)

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

1. (Judicial Rents) — Return for the month of December, 1901. (August 20.)

2. (Proceedings) — Return for the months of April, May, and June, 1902. (August 22.)

Return for the month of July, 1902. (September 23.)

SALMON FISHERIES (ROYAL COMMISSION ON SALMON FISHERIES).

Report of the Commissioners on Salmon Fisheries—

- Part II. Minutes of evidence and indices. (August 22.)
- Part III. Appendix (Section I. and II.). (September 1.)

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES (1901).

Area, houses, and population; population classified by ages, condition as to marriage, occupations, birthplaces and infirmities—

1. County of Devon. (August 26.)
2. County of Hants (Southampton). (August 26.)
3. County of Surrey. (August 26.)
4. County of Gloucester. (September 10.)
5. County of Sussex. (September 10.)
6. County of Worcester. (September 20.)
7. County of Northumberland. (September 20.)
8. County of Nottingham. (September 20.)
9. County of Norfolk. (October 13.)
10. County of Lincoln. (October 13.)
11. County of Derby. (October 13.)

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).

The Twentieth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, for the year 1901. Part III. Scientific Investigation. (August 26.)

EXPLOSIVES.

1. Accident at Messrs. Pain and Sons Factory at Mitcham, Surrey. Report to the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Captain A. P. H. Desborough, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, on the circumstances attending an accident which occurred in the building for non-explosive ingredients at the factory of Messrs. James Pain and Sons at Mitcham, Surrey, on the th of June, 1902. (August 27.)

2. Explosion of Detonators at the Patent Electric Shot Firing Company's Factory near Chorley, Lancashire). Report to the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Major A. O. Key, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, on the circumstances attending an accident which occurred at the factory of the Patent Electric Shot Firing Company, near Chorley, Lancashire, on the 19th June, 1902. (September 16.)

BANKING, RAILWAY, AND SHIPPING STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Report for the year 1902. (August 29.)

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Report of the Commissioners of Prisons and the Directors of Convict Prisons, with appendices, for the year ended 31st March, 1902. (August 29.)

ARMY.

1. Report on trials of self-propelled lorries for military purposes, at Aldershot from 4th to 19th December, 1901. (August 29.)

2. Special Pensions—Return for the year ended 31st March, 1902, of pensions specially granted under Articles 730, 1173A, and the Army Pay Warrant. (September 3.)

3. Report on the discipline and management of military prisons. (September 20.)

4. Report of the Court of Enquiry on the administration of the Army Re-mount Department. (October 3.)

5. War in South Africa—Return of Military Forces in South Africa, 1899–1902; strength of garrison on 1st August, 1899; re-inforcements and casualties, etc., between 1st August 1899 and 31st May, 1902; continuation of [Cd. 892.] (August 29.)

INDIA.

1. Statistical Abstract relating to British India from 1891-1892 to 1901: Thirty-sixth Number. (September 3).

2. Review of the Trade of India in 1900-1901. (September 5.)

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE (INDIAN SECTION).

Annual Report for the year 1901–1902. (September 3).

WEST INDIES.

Correspondence relating to the volcanic eruptions in St. Vincent and Martinique in May, 1902; with map and appendix. (September 4).

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1898.

Return showing the total payments into and out of the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account, for the financial year 1901–1902. (September 4.)

PETERHEAD HARBOUR.

Reports respecting Peterhead Harbour Works (in continuation of [Cd. 813.]). (September 5.)

SOUTH AFRICA.

Papers relating to an interview between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and Generals Botha, De Wet, and De La Rey, on 5th September, 1902. (September 8.)

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Lists of Schools under the administration of the Board, 1901–1902.

Report for the year 1901 on the Museums, Colleges, and Institutions under the administration of the Board.

Grants paid to School Boards under Section 97, Elementary Education Act, 1870.

School Board Accounts.

List of Loans.

Report of the Board for the year 1901–1902. (September 11.)

TREATY SERIES, No. 12. (1902.)

Convention regulating the telephone service between Great Britain and France; signed at Paris, 29th July, 1902. (September 13.)

QUEENSLAND.

Papers relating to the Pacific Island Labourers Act (1901) of the Commonwealth of Australia. (September 20.)

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

Annual Report for the year 1901. (September 22).

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops, for the year 1901. Part II. Tables. (September 27).

STRAITS SETTLEMENTS.

Reports on the Federated Malay States for 1901. (October 3).

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (GREAT BRITAIN).

Forty-fifth Report, for the year 1901, of the Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools. Part II. General Report and Appendices III. to XI. (October 3).

VENTILATION OF FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS.

First Report, with Appendices, of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into the ventilation of factories and workshops. (October 13).

RAILWAY SERVANTS (HOURS OF LABOUR).

Return, in pursuance of Section 4 of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1899, of railway servants of certain classes who were on one or more occasions during the month of December, 1901, on duty on the railways of the United Kingdom for more than twelve hours at a time, or who after being on duty more than twelve hours were allowed to resume work with less than nine hours' rest. (October 14).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

TREATY SERIES, No. 13 (1902).

Declaration amending Article XI. of the Treaty between the United Kingdom and Austria-Hungary of 3rd December 1873, for the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals; signed at London, 26th June, 1901 (Ratifications exchanged at London, 25th June, (1902).

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Returns of accidents and casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several railway companies in the United Kingdom during the six months ending June, 1902, in pursuance of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1871; together with reports of the inspecting officers, assistant inspecting officers, and sub-inspectors of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain accidents which were inquired into.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Appendix, Section III., to the Annual Report of the Commissioners, for the year 1901.

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (IRELAND).

Fortieth Report of the Inspector, for the year 1901.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

COMPANIES (WINDING UP) ACT, 1890.

General rule, dated 14th August, 1902.

SUPERANNUATION.

I. Treasury Minutes, dated 14th August and 2nd September, 1902, declaring that, for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of (*a*) Inspector of Fisheries (Board of Trade), and (*b*) such Veterinary Inspectors and Assistant Veterinary Inspectors (Board of Agriculture) at ports as give their whole time to their official duties, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service are required.

II. Treasury Minutes, dated—

1. 3rd September, 1902, declaring that John Sands, Lad, Royal Laboratory, War Office;
2. 1st October, 1902, declaring that Robert Henry, Engineer, Revenue Cruiser "Vigilant," Customs;

were appointed without civil service certificates through inadvertence on the part of the heads of their department.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

Account of the receipts and expenditure of the Paymaster General on behalf of the Supreme Court of Judicature in respect of the funds of Suitors of the Court, in the year ended 28th February, 1902: Also, account of the National Debt Commissioners for the same period, in respect of funds held by them on behalf of the Supreme Court of Judicature, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon.

PUBLIC RECORDS (TREASURY).

Schedule containing a list and particulars of classes of documents which have been removed from the Solicitor's Department of the Treasury to the Public Record Office, but which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein.

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.

Seventeen proclamations, dated 1st September, 1902, applying certain of the provisions of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, to the counties, county boroughs, and rural and urban districts therein respectively mentioned.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Additional Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland, dated 3rd September, 1902.

PAWNBROKERS' RETURNS (IRELAND).

Returns from the City Marshal of Dublin, for the year ended 31st December, 1901.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AMENDMENT ACT, 1868.

Rules made by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, pursuant to the provisions of the Act for regulating the execution of capital sentences in Ireland.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1877, AND SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND ACTS, 1885 to 1889.

Order by the Secretary for Scotland closing the existing Prison of Inverness.

INDIA.

I. Loans raised in England—Return of all loans raised in England under the provisions of any Acts of Parliament chargeable on the revenues of India outstanding at the commencement of the half year ended on the 30th September, 1902, with the rates of interest and total amount payable thereon, etc.

II. Examinations — Regulations for examinations for the Civil Service of India.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

Special Exemption: Night Work (Lead and Zinc Mines)—Order, dated 22nd August, 1902, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 54 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending the special exception under that section to concentration works at lead and zinc mines, so far as regards young persons of the age of 16 years and upwards.

Dangerous and Unhealthy Industries —Regulations, dated 12th August, 1902, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 79 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, for the manufacture of felt hats where any inflammable solvent is used.

POLLING DISTRICTS.

Orders made by the County Councils of—

I. The county of Warwick.
II. The county of Northumberland;
altering certain polling districts in the said counties.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD.

Accounts for the year ending 1st July, 1902; delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

*EARL SPENCER: Perhaps the noble Duke will inform the House what he proposes should be done with regard to the sittings of this House during this adjourned Session of Parliament?

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The DUKE of DEVONSHIRE): Your lordships are aware that there are no Orders or notices on the Paper today, and so far as I can learn there is no probability of there being any business for this House to consider immediately. Probably it will therefore be convenient that we should adjourn for a short time, and I would suggest that we should adjourn for a little more than a fortnight, until Monday, November 3.

*EARL SPENCER: So far as I have heard from friends of mine, and as far as I feel myself on the subject, I should certainly be quite ready to agree to the proposal the noble Duke has made. May I refer to another matter? There was a Select Committee appointed just before the adjournment, and I had the honour to be selected as Chairman at the only meeting which took place—I refer to the Light Load Line Committee. Since then the representative of the Government on the Committee has become Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and I hardly think that my noble friend will have such anxiety to take part in the business of the House and this Committee that he will come over from Ireland for the purpose. That may be a reason for reconsidering the constitution of the Committee. I do not believe it is usual or customary for Select Committees to sit when the House meets as it now does—I think it would be very inconvenient to noble Lords who are on this Committee that it should sit when the House will be only sitting on occasional days. I do not know whether the noble Duke will have any objection to it, but I should certainly propose that the sittings of this Committee should be postponed until the ordinary meeting of Parliament next year.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: The reason given by my noble friend with reference to the appointment of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade to the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland will no doubt render it necessary to make a fresh appointment to this Committee. I think it would certainly be most highly inconvenient that noble Lords should be expected to attend the sittings of a Committee when the House is not regularly sitting; and unless the business before a Committee is of so urgent a character as not to permit of postponement, I think the preferable course would be that its sittings should be adjourned to the regular Session. I think this observation entirely applies to the Committee referred to, and I suggest therefore that the proceedings should be adjourned until the ordinary Session.

House adjourned at twenty-five before Five o'clock, to Monday, the 3rd of November next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 16*th October*, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

NEW WRITS.

FOR COUNTY OF ORKNEY AND SHETLAND.

In the room of John Cathcart Wason, Esq. (Chiltern Hundreds).—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

BOROUGH OF DEVONPORT.

Edward John Chalmers Morton, Esq., deceased.—(*Mr. William M'Arthur.*)

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE (IRELAND) ACT (1887) (IMPRISONMENT OF MEMBERS).

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following letter relating to the imprisonment of two Members:—

"Dublin,
"58 Palmerston Road,
"6th October, 1902.

"SIR,—I have the honour to inform you that Haviland-Burke, Esq., Member for the Tullamore Division of the King's County, and Michael Reddy, Esq., Member for the Birr Division of the said county, were, on the 2nd day of October instant, on appeal, convicted by me, sitting at Birr in said county, as sole judge under the provisions of The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887.

"For that they with others, on the 15th day of August, 1902, at Birr, in the King's County aforesaid, being a proclaimed district under the provisions of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, did wrongfully and without legal authority unlawfully use intimidation towards certain shopkeepers residing in the town of Birr aforesaid, with the view to cause the said shopkeepers to do an act which they had a legal right to abstain from doing, namely, to join a certain Society or Association commonly called the United Irish League.

"And further, that they, on the said 15th day of August, 1902, at Birr aforesaid, being a proclaimed district as aforesaid, did unlawfully and without legal authority unlawfully incite certain other persons whose names are unknown, to use intimidation towards certain shopkeepers whose names are unknown, residing in the town of Birr aforesaid, with a view to cause the said shopkeepers to do an act which they had a legal right to abstain from doing, namely, to join a certain Society or Association commonly called the United Irish League.

"And further, that they on the day and year aforesaid and at the place aforesaid, took part in an unlawful assembly, to wit, that they, together with other persons to the number of five and more whose names are unknown, unlawfully did assemble together to the disturbance of the public peace and with intent to stir up hatred and ill will between divers classes of His Majesty's subjects, and with the further intent unlawfully to incite said other persons to enter into a Criminal Conspiracy to compel certain traders in the town of Birr, whose names are unknown, to do what they had a legal right to abstain from doing, namely, to join a certain Society or Association, commonly called the United Irish League.

"The said Haviland-Burke, Esq., M.P., was sentenced by me to one calendar month's imprisonment without hard labour on each count.

"And the said Michael Reddy, Esq., M.P., was sentenced by me to two calendar months' imprisonment, without hard labour on each count, and that at the expiration of said term of imprisonment the said Michael Reddy, M.P., enter into sureties to be of the peace and good behaviour towards all His Majesty's subjects for twelve calendar months, himself in the sum of £50, and two solvent sureties in the sum of £25 each, and in default of entering into such sureties to be imprisoned for a further period of three months without hard labour unless he shall sooner enter into such sureties.

"Such sentences upon the said several counts to run concurrently in the case of both Mr. Haviland-Burke and Mr. Michael Reddy.

"I have the honour to remain, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"JOHM ADYE CURRAN.
"Chairman of Quarter Sessions
"for King's County.

"To the Right Honourable the Speaker,
"House of Commons."

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): May I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether you have received any letters from resident magistrates announcing the arrest of Irish Members under the Coercion Act? No fewer than ten Irish Members have been arrested on the warrants of removable coercion magistrates since the House rose in August last and imprisoned on criminal charges.

*MR. SPEAKER: No, I have not received any such letters.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Then, as a matter of privilege, I understand it is the bounden duty of the person by whose authority such warrants are executed, to communicate the facts as to the arrests to Mr. Speaker at once, whether Parliament is sitting or not, and whether adjourned or prorogued. The resident magistrates in Ireland, however, have not done so, although some of these arrests are two months old, and thus they have violated the privileges of this House.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is not a breach of privilege, although it would have been the usual and proper course to take. I do not know the circumstances, nor can they be inquired into at this moment. The magistrates may have some reason to offer when they write and inform me, as they probably will do, why they have not communicated sooner.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I submit that it is not a matter for the magistrates so much as for the House to consider. No distinction ought to be made in a matter of this kind between an Irish and a British Member.

*MR. SPEAKER: I hope that if the hon. Member raises a point of order he will do so in the ordinary way, and not make suggestions of that kind, which are wholly unfounded.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: That, Sir, is a matter of opinion.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! An hon. Member expressing his opinion in this House must do so with due respect to the Chair, upon which I understand him to be reflecting.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I had not the slightest intention of acting disrespectfully to the Chair, but I still maintain that there should be no difference in the treatment of Members. It has always been laid down that an hon. Member is *primâ facie* protected in reference to criminal proceedings, unless they are announced to this House, and it is a privilege of a Member of this House that the fact of his arrest should be communicated at the earliest possible moment. I shall be prepared at the proper time to prove that since the 8th August last, ten Members of this House have been arrested on criminal charges.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has already stated that, and I have informed him that the failure to communicate the fact to me has never to my recollection been treated as a breach of privilege, although the course referred to is the proper and courteous one for a magistrate or judge to take.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Would I be in order in putting a Motion on the Paper expressing the dissatisfaction of this House at the want of courtesy shown them in not so communicating?

*Mr. SPEAKER: I have no doubt a Motion could be framed that would be in order.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I will do my best, Sir.

NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

The right hon. Sir William Hood Walrond, baronet for County of Devon (North-Eastern or Tiverton Division).

The right hon. Joseph Austen Chamberlain, County of Worcester (Eastern Division).

Henry William Forster, esquire, County of Kent (Western or Sevenoaks Division).

Thomas Henry Sloane, esquire, Borough of Belfast (South Belfast Division).

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against; From Mexborough; and Maidstone; to lie upon the Table.

LONDON WATER BILL.

Petition from Lambeth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation; From Grays; Malvern; Chard; Yeovil; Maidstone; Keynsham; Salisbury; Rothwell; Murton; Brighouse; Queensbury; Low Moorsley; Cardiff; Easington Lane; Lea and Holloway; Great Horton; Sheffield; Keyworth; North Shields; Hucknall Torkard; Peterborough; St. George; Wolverton; Shepshed; Fenny Stratford; Stoney Stanton; Ashby de la Zouch; Pendleton; Huntingdon; Cinderford; Abersychan; Slough; Castle Howard; Manchester; Thirsk; Wirksworth; Ulverston; Cinderhill; Silsoe; Wishaw; Glossop Dale; Compstall; Ynysybwl; Bream; Ramsgate; Margate; Bromsgrove; Rugeley; Tamworth; New Mills; Hadfield; Carluke; Strathaven; Long Eaton; Stapleford; Langley Mill; and, High Wycombe; to lie upon the Table.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for the abolition of restricsions; From Maidstone; Grays; Malvern; Chard; Yeovil; Cardiff; Huntingdon; Keynsham; Salisbury; Rothwell; Brighouse; Murton; Queensbury; Low Moorsley; Easington Lane, Great Horton; Lea and Holloway; Sheffield; Silsoe; Shepshed; Keyworth; Hucknall Torkard; North Shields; High Wycombe; St. George; Ashby de la Zouch; Wolverton; Stoney Stanton; Abersychan; Fenny Stratford; Pendleton; Slough; Newtonshaw; Alva; Manchester; Alloa; Wirksworth; Ulverston; Cinderhill; Thirsk; Wishaw; Peterborough; Glossop Dale; Compstall; Cinderford; Bream; Ynysybwl; Ramsgate; Margate; Bromsgrove; Tamworth; Rugeley; Hayfield; New Mills; Hadfield; Carluke; Strathaven; Langley Mills and Aldercar; Long Eaton; and Stapleford; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; From Queensbury; Maidstone; Grays; Malvern; Chard; Yeovil; Keynsham; Salisbury; Murton Colliery; Rothwell; Brighouse; Low Moorsley; Cardiff; Easington Lane; Larkhall; Lea and Holloway; Sheffield; Keyworth; North Shields; Hucknall Torkard; Peterborough; Glasgow; Shepshed; Bletchley; Ashby de la Zouch; Stoney Stanton; Wolverton; Huntingdon; Abersychan; High Wycombe; Castle Howard; Manchester; Wirksworth; Ulverston; Cinderhill; Silsoe; Thirsk; Wishaw; Glossop Dale; Compstall; Slough; Cinderford; Ynysybwl; Bream; Ramsgate; Margate; Bromsgrove; Tamworth; Rugeley; Hayfield; New Mills; Hadfield - Carluke; Strathaven; Long Eaton; Stapleford; and Langley Mill; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).

The following papers, presented by Command of His Majesty during the Recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August 1896 :—

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Nos. 2875 to 2906.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Nos. 580 to 583.

TREATY SERIES (No. 12, 1902).

Copy of Convention regulating the Telephone Service between Great Britain and France. Signed at Paris, 29th July, 1902.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copies of Reports, Nos. 359 (Gibraltar, Annual Report for 1901), 360 (Straits Settlements, Annual Report for 1901), 361 (Sierra Leone, Annual Report for 1901), 362 (British Honduras, Annual Report for 1901), 363 (Turks and Caicos Islands, Annnal Report for 1901), 364 (Seychelles, Annual Report for 1901), 365 (Bahamas, Annual Report for 1901–2, with a Report on the Salt Industry of Inagna), 366 (Fiji, Annual Report for 1901), 367 (Ceylon, Annual Report for 1901), 368 (Barbados, Annual Report for 1901–2).

COLONIAL REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS).

Copies of Reports, No. 20 (Wei-hai-Wei) [General Report by Mr. G. J. Hare, Acting-Assistant Commissioner], and No. 21 [Dominica (Reports on the Caribs of Dominica)].

SOUTH AFRICA.

Copy of Papers relating to an interview between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and Generals Botha, De Wet, and De la Rey, on 5th September, 1902.

WEST INDIES.

Copy of Correspondence relating to the Volcanic Eruptions in St. Vincent and Martinique, in May, 1902, with Map and Appendix.

STRAITS SETTLEMENTS (FEDERATED MALAY STATES).

Copy of Reports on the Federated Malay States for 1901.

QUEENSLAND.

Copy of Papers relating to the Pacific Island Labourers' Act, 1901, of the Commonwealth of Australia.

MINES AND QUARRIES.

Copy of General Report and Statistics for the year 1901, Part III., Output; General Report and Statistics relating to the Output and Value of the Minerals raised in the United Kingdom, the amount and value of the metals produced, and the exports and imports of Minerals.

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Copy of Report of the Commissioners of Prisons and the Directors of Convict Prisons, with Appendices, for the year ended 31st March, 1902.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS.

Copy of Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops for 1901. Part II. Tables.

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (GREAT BRITAIN).

Copy of Forty-fifth Report of His Majesty's Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools for 1901. Part II. General Report and Appendices III. to XI.

VENTILATION OF FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS.

Copy of First Report with Appendices of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into the Ventilation of Factories and Workshops.

EXPLOSIONS (EXPLOSION OF DETONATORS AT THE PATENT ELECTRIC SHOT-FIRING COMPANY'S FACTORY, NEAR CHORLEY, LANCASHIRE).

Copy of Report by Major A. Cooper-Key, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending an accident which occurred at the factory of the patent Electric Shot-Firing Company, near Chorley, Lancashire, on the 19th June, 1902.

EXPLOSIONS (ACCIDENT AT MESSRS. PAIN AND SONS' FACTORY AT MITCHAM, SURREY).

Copy of Report by Captain A. P. H. Desborough, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending an accident which occurred in the building for non-explosive ingredients at the factory of Messrs. James Pain and Sons, at Mitcham, Surrey, on the 5th June, 1902.

SALMON FISHERIES (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy of Report of the Royal Commissioners on Salmon Fisheries (Part II., Minutes of Evidence and Indexes; Part III., Appendix, Sections I. and II.).

PATRIOTIC FUND.

Copy of Fortieth Report of the Royal Commissioners of the Patriotic Fund.

MILITARY PRISONS.

Copy of Report on the Discipline and Management of Military Prisons, 1901.

ARMY (REMOUNT DEPARTMENT).

Copy of Report of the Court of Inquiry on the Administration of the Army Remount Department.

ARMY (SELF-PROPELLED LORRIES).

Copy of Report on Trials of Self-propelled Lorries for Military purposes, held at Aldershot from 4th to 19th December, 1901.

ARMY (SPECIAL PENSIONS).

Copy of Return for the year ended 31st March, 1902, of Pensions specially granted under Articles 730, 1173A, and 1207 of the Army Pay Warrant.

FISHERIES (IRELAND).

Copy of Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the Sea and Inland Fisheries of Ireland for 1901. Part I. General Report.

LUNACY (IRELAND).

Copy of Fifty-first Report, with Appendices, of Inspectors of Lunatics (Ireland) for the year 1901.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Copy of Abstracts showing the Acreage under Crops and the number of Live Stock in each County and Province of Ireland for the year 1901-2.

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

Copy of Twentieth Report of the Royal University of Ireland, being for the year 1901.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

Copy of Return of Proceedings during the months of April, May, June, and July, 1902.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (JUDICIAL RENTS).

Copy of Return for the month of December, 1901.

BANKING, RAILWAY, AND SHIPPING STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Copy of Report on the Banking, Railway, and Shipping Statistics of Ireland for the half-year ended 30th June, 1902.

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND).

Copy of Twentieth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1901, Part III.

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1898.

Copy of Return showing the Total Payments into and out of the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account for the financial year 1901-2.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy of Report for the year 1901 on the Museums, Colleges, and Institutions under the administration of the Board of Education.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy of Lists of Schools under the administration of the Board of Education, 1901-2.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy of (1) Grants paid to School Boards under Section 97 Elementary Education Act, 1870, (2) School Board Accounts, (3) List of Loans, for 1901–2.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy of Report of the Board of Education for the year 1901–2.

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE (INDIAN SECTION).

Copy of Annual Report of the Imperial Institute (Indian Section) for the year 1901–2.

EAST INDIA (TRADE).

Copy of Review of the Trade of India, 1901–2.

EAST INDIA (STATISTICAL ABSTRACT).

Copy of Statistical Abstract relating to British India, from 1891–2 to 1900–1901. Thirty-sixth Number.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Copy of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the six months ended 30th June, 1902, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain Accidents which were inquired into.

RAILWAY SERVANTS (HOURS OF LABOUR).

Copy of Return, in pursuance of Section 4 of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, of Railway Servants of certain classes who were on one or more occasions during the month of December, 1901, on duty on the railways of the United Kingdom for more than twelve hours at a time; or who, after being on duty more than twelve hours were allowed to resume work with less than nine hours' rest.

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES, 1901.

Copy of Census of England and Wales, 1901, (Counties of Devon, Hants (Southampton), Surrey, Gloucester, Sussex, Northumberland, Nottingham, Worcester, Derby, Lincoln, and Norfolk).

PETERHEAD HARBOUR.

Copy of Report respecting Peterhead Harbour Works.

Ordered, That the said Papers do lie upon the Table.

SEA FISHERIES (IRELAND) ACT, 1883.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 11th July: *Mr Moore*]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

Account presented, of Receipts and Expenditure of the Paymaster General on behalf of the Supreme Court of Judicature in respect of the Funds of Suitors of the Court in the year ended 28th February, 1902, and of Account of the National Debt Commissioners for the same period in respect of Funds held by them on behalf of the Supreme Court of Judicature, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 353.]

SUPERANNUATIONS.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 14th August, 1902, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Inspector of Fisheries, Board of Trade, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the Public Service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATIONS.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 2nd September, 1902, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the offices of such Veterinary Inspectors and Assistant Veterinary Inspectors (Board of Agriculture) at Ports as do give their whole time to their official duties, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the Public Service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 1st October, 1902, declaring that Robert Henry, Engineer, Revenue Cruiser "Vigilant," Customs, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 3rd September, 1902, declaring that John Sands, lad, Royal Laboratory, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate, through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN ENGLAND).

Copy presented, of return of all Loans raised in England, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on the 30th September, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 354.]

EAST INDIA (EXAMINATIONS).

Copy presented, of Regulations for Examinations for the Civil Service of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Fortieth Report of the Inspector for the year 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Appendix, Section III. to the Sixty-eighth Report of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, for the year 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (PROCLAMATIONS).

Copies presented, of Seventeen Proclamations, dated 1st September, 1902, applying certain of the provisions of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, to the counties, county boroughs, and rural and urban districts in Ireland therein respectively mentioned [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Rules made by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, pursuant to the provisions of the Capital Punishment Amendment Act, 1868, for regulating the execution of Capital Sentences in Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Additional Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland, dated 3rd September, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PAWNBROKERS' RETURNS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Returns from the City Marshal of Dublin for the year ended 31st December 1901, [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (COURTS MARTIAL).

Copy presented, of Return of the number of Courts Martial held and Summary Punishments inflicted during the year 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GREENWICH OBSERVATORY.

Copy presented, of Report of the Astronomer Royal to the Board of Visitors of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (SHIPS' BOILERS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 13th May; *Lord Charles Beresford*]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVAL TRAINING SHIPS.

Return presented relative thereto [ordered 19th June; *Mr. Charles M'Arthur*]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF WARWICK).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Warwick on the 5th May, 1902, altering certain Polling Districts in the County [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF NORTHUMBERLAND).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Northumberland altering certain Polling Districts in the County [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS (SPECIAL EXCEPTION—NIGHT WORK—LEAD AND ZINC MINES).

Copy presented, of Order, dated 22nd August, 1902, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 54 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending the special exception under that section to concentration works at Lead and Zinc Mines, so far as regards young persons of the age of 16 years and upwards [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS (DANGEROUS AND UNHEALTHY INDUSTRIES).

Copy presented, of Regulations dated 12th August, 1902, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 79 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, for the manufacture of felt hats where any inflammable solvent is used [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Secretary for Scotland, closing the existing Prison of Inverness [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 13, 1902).

Copy presented, of Declaration amending Article XI. of the Treaty between the United Kingdom and Austria-Hungary, of 3rd December, 1873, for the Mutual Surrender of Fugitive Criminals. Signed at London, 26th June, 1901. Ratifications exchanged at London, 25th June, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (REMOUNT DEPARTMENT).

Copy presented, of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Court of Inquiry on the Administration of the Army Remount Department, together with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (REMOUNT DEPARTMENT).

Copy presented, of Reports by Officers appointed by the Commander-in Chief to inquire into the working of the Remount Department Abroad [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

1. Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890.—Copy of General Rule made pursuant to Section 26 of The Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890, dated 14th August, 1902 [by Act].

2. Mersey Docks and Harbour Board.—Copy of Accounts of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board for the year ending 1st July, 1902 [by Act].

3. Public Records (Treasury).—Copy of Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents which have been removed from the Solicitor's Department of the Treasury to the Public Record Office, but which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify the preservation therein [by Act].

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I wish to ask the Prime Minister if the Motion he intends to move presently will allow the discussion after twelve o'clock at night of what are called "Forty days on the Table" Motions. It is just possible there may be a Home Office Rule laid on the Table of these autumn sittings to which we may wish to call attention: hence my Question.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Yes, I think the right hon. Baronet is right. I do not think it would be proper for the House to exclude from itself the possibility of discussing such a matter as this.

THE CONDITION OF IRELAND.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I desire, on behalf of the Irish party, to ask the Leader of the House whether, in view of recent occurrences in Ireland, he is prepared to give early, ample, and special time for the discussion of the condition of things in that country.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg to thank the hon. Gentleman for his courtesy in giving me notice of this Question. I do not think it is either necessary or desirable to give the special facilities which the hon. Gentleman seeks.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): I would ask the Prime Minister whether, having regard to the fact that my hon. friend speaks for eighty-two of the representatives of Ireland, and that the events that are occurring in Ireland are matters requiring immediate discussion, he will not look into the question a little further and see if he can not give us at least one day for the discussion of these matters, and whether even the loss of a day might not possibly turn out to be a good economy of time for the Government, while giving common fair play to the representatives of Ireland.

MR. A J. BALFOUR: I do not think it would be an economy of time to have a day formally given up to the discussion of Irish affairs in addition to all the opportunities which no doubt hon. Gentlemen will find for dealing with affairs in Ireland.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): Without at all interfering or expressing an opinion as to the policy of the Government in Ireland, may I not put it to the right hon. Gentleman that in former times it was always the practice to introduce a coercive system for Ireland by long discussions in this House? The right hon. Gentleman introduced and passed a Bill —perhaps wisely; I do not pass any opinion upon that—which prevented any form of discussion before coercion was introduced. I would submit to him for consideration whether he should not on this occasion, when so large a portion of Ireland has been placed under exceptional law, grant the request of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman probably remembers that we had a discussion upon the placing of certain parts of Ireland under proclamation during the earlier part of this Session, and I do not know that a renewed discussion on the same topic would serve any public interest. Of course, if the Front Opposition Bench were to take such a view of the government of Ireland as to justify them in asking for a day in order to condemn formally the policy of the Government, that day would at once be granted. I do not think it is in conformity with the ordinary usages and practices of this House to grant the request in the form in which it has been made this afternoon.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: May I ask whether, in giving his answer, the right hon. Gentleman is aware that amongst the occurrences we have to complain of since the House last met is the proclamation of the city of Dublin, where, on the authority of the Judges themselves, there is absolutely no crime.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is now debating the question.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: May I ask the Prime Minister whether he has not just now laid down the position that he will give a day for the discussion of the grievances of Ireland if a British party demand it, but that he will not give a day for that purpose when it is demanded by five-sixths of the representatives of Ireland.

AN IRISH MEMBER: It's the old story.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Precisely. It is the old story. I am following, as I propose to follow, the time-honoured tradition of this House, under which a day for a vote of censure is not granted except on the demand of the Opposition.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: And I was called to order a few minutes ago for saying that there was one law for the British and another for the Irish Member.

MR. McVEAGH (Down, S.): So there is.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to ask if I am to assume that his reply to the right hon. Gentleman on the Front Opposition Bench is a reply to me, and that we will get a day?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the hon. Gentleman must settle that with his friends on the Front Opposition Bench.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (AUTUMN SITTINGS).

(2.35.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I rise, Sir, to move the resolution which was placed on the paper before the House separated in August last—namely, "That, for the remainder of the Session, Government business do have precedence at every sitting, and at the conclusion of Government business on each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put." I have very little to say on the subject except what the House is already thoroughly familiar with. We have resumed our work at this early date because we have before us the business of dealing with the Education Bill, and of carrying our proceedings on that Bill to a successful termination. There is one other large and important measure which we must also finish and on which substantial progress has been made. I mean the London Water Bill, which is a measure of the greatest importance to the metropolis. There are some other absolutely necessary matters which would have been dealt with in the earlier part of the session had we not thought it desirable to make continuous progress with the Education Bill, and reserve them for the autumn. We must pass the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, and we must have a resolution in connection with the treaty on the sugar bounties. We ought certainly to introduce a Bill making it practically possible for the nation to accept the gracious gift which His Majesty has made in respect to Osborne. There must be a Vote in Supply to carry out the conditions of peace in connection with the Transvaal, and I must ask the House to turn the new Sessional Orders into Standing Orders—a matter which I do not think ought to take any very great time—and, of course, we will deal with the Indian Budget, and it may be that we shall also have to deal with the question of the Uganda Railway. I do not anticipate that the list I have read out will in any way prolong the length of our autumnal labours, because, as the House is aware, there must be some interstices in the consideration of the Education Bill which may thus be usefully filled up. There are a few other measures on the Order Paper, which I think, are uncontroversial. With regard to these I shall certainly not think of asking the House to make any exceptional exertions, but, if there is a general desire that they should pass, I think they ought to pass into law. That, Sir, is really the statement which the House probably desires I should make on the question. I am not going to justify the course we have pursued in asking the House to meet again in the autumn. Those reasons are perfectly well known to all parties, and it will be sufficient, therefore, if I now ask you to put the Resolution from the Chair.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, for the remainder of the Session, Government Business do have precedence at every Sitting, and at the conclusion of Government Business on each day, Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put." (*Mr. Balfour.*)

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is there not a supplementary Vote of £3,000 for the allowance to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland which must be passed? I am very anxious about that Vote.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not aware that there is any necessity to bring in a supplementary Vote on that subject. If the hon. Gentleman will put a Question to me on the matter I will inquire into it.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: You certainly told me so last session.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said the right hon. Gentleman had given the House a most meagre statement, and one far from satisfying the natural curiosity of the House. Of course none of them desired to prolong their sitting beyond what was absolutely necessary. He would not now comment upon the main purpose for which the right hon. Gentleman had called them together, although he was tempted to ask him whether, after the expression of opinion he had received from the country during the recess, he would not have done better to reconsider his position. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that they were not afraid of coming to close quarters with him on the Education Bill. The House must not forget that there were several important differences between the position in which they stood now and that in which the House stood in 1893, when time was given to the Government for carrying on the business that stood over from the earlier part of the Session. In 1893 they met in the autumn in order to carry the Parish Councils Bill. That was a Bill upon which both sides of the House were agreed, and the second reading of which was not opposed. They had now a Bill which was not merely a question of the keenest controversy between the majority and the minority, but also between the majority of this House and the country. In 1893 there was a safety valve in the power of moving the adjournment at Question time—a power which had since been so greatly curtailed as to have been practically extinguished. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to give the House an assurance that when any question of urgency and importance arose, he would allow the House an opportunity of discussing it. One such question had arisen in regard to Ireland—the question of the use which the Government were making of the powers which the law placed in their hands—and it might at any moment assume an even more menacing aspect. There were questions connected with the state of things in South Africa. He was afraid the position in South Africa was full of difficulty, and that these difficulties were not diminishing. Then, in the last fortnight we had seen the smouldering embers of unrest in the East again bursting into flame. These were only three of many questions which might arise, and which the House ought to have an opportunity of discussing. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman would tell him that such an opportunity would be given if a vote of no confidence were proposed. But that was not by any means the most convenient way of dealing with such matters. There were many cases in which the House had a right to fuller or better information than could be elicited by means of Questions across the Table, and they desired to have opportunities of expressing their opinions on subjects which could not be suitably raised by a vote of no confidence. The right hon. Gentleman had not given them some information which he thought they were entitled to have. Would he give an undertaking that there would be no suspension of the Twelve o'Clock Rule? He had already made a very severe demand on the health and patience of hon. Members by calling them together this autumn, and they ought to have some assurance that they would not be required to sit after midnight. Again, the right hon. Gentleman had not indicated the order in which he proposed to take the business. Did he propose to carry the Education Bill through all its stages before taking up the London Water Bill? At what point between now and Christmas did he propose to ask the House to consider the Sugar Bounties Convention, and the Uganda Railway? Again, the Vote for carrying out the conditions of peace in the Transvaal involved very important questions, and the House certainly ought to have plenty of time to make up its mind in regard to them. Lastly, he came to the Rules of Proceedure. Did the right hon. Gentleman intend to reserve them until the very end of the sitting? If so, he would like to utter one word of warning. There were large and difficult questions which had been left unsettled, and one Rule had actually been left hanging in the air since the middle of the session. Another Rule which provided for the beginning of business at two o'clock had given rise to very general disapproval and discontent, and he was sure the House would very much object to not having ample time for debating these questions. Would it not be better to relegate them to the commencement of next session? Seeing that so much of the time of the House would necessarily be given to the highly controversial measure which the right hon. Gentleman had put in the fore-front of his programme, he did hope the right hon. Gentleman would reduce his demands as much as possible, and not force the House to deal with questions of great importance with undue and unreasonable haste.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said the right hon. Gentlemen had not made any allusion to the circumstances under which he had been compelled to make this Motion. The House unanimously put into the Rules of the Procedure—on the suggestion of the hon. Member for King's Lynn—a proviso dealing with autumn sittings, and the right hon. Gentleman ought to have mentioned that the Motion was more severe and drastic than he had expected it to be, and the question he put to the Prime Minister a little earlier in the sitting—with reference to "Forty days on the Table" Motions, only illustrated the tightness with which it had been drawn. He understood the right hon. Gentleman to tell him that motions of the character to which he then referred—were not to be precluded from discussion, but he feared that unless the right hon. Gentleman modified his present proposal it would be found impossible to debate them after midnight. He would like to ask the

House to consider the language used by the Government in reference to the opportunities of private Members for discussion under the Rules of Procedure. When the Prime Minister was attacked by some of them for having deprived the House of opportunities of free discussion, the right hon. Gentleman replied that whilst the proper rights of Members were largely intrenched upon, the Government gave a valuable consideration in exchange—namely, that two nights a week would not be disturbed by Government interference, and that the Government would not in the future come down and say they required the whole of the time for Government business. The Prime Minister had also made the statement that the real privileges of Members would be greatly increased. The matter of the autumn sittings had been raised by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, who pointed out that as there was every prospect that the House would have to sit through the winter, it would be monstrous to deny them their right to discuss matters other than the particular business which had necessitated the autumn sitting. For his own part he did not suggest that the right hon. Gentleman would not be within his rights in asking at some period of the autumn sittings for some portion of Members' time, but after the words the right hon. Gentleman had used about the rights of private Members it was amazing that the rule should have been drawn so tight, and without a word of explanation to the House. This was not a matter which solely affected private Members. It was one in which the whole country was concerned. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen seemed inclined to think his appeal was likely to be accepted by the Government, but the answer which had been made to the request of the Irish Members for an opportunity of discussing the condition of Ireland was by no means encouraging. It was suggested that Motions for Adjournment would afford an opportunity of discussing important questions, but they were not always the most convenient way of obtaining the judgment of the House. During the autumn the Government would have to consider their legislative programme for next year. As a matter of fact, there were many subjects on which the Government could legislate with more safety to themselves and satisfaction to the country than the Education Bill for which this demand was made. There were matters on which the Government were pledged to legislate, and on which the House ought to have an opportunity of expressing its views in a constitutional way. There was, for instance, the question of the efficiency of the public service. Surely that was not a matter which could be dealt with on a Motion for the Adjournment of the House. There was the Bill dealing with the hours of shop assistants, and that was a matter which interested a great number of people. The Government were pledged to deal with this question. How were they to induce the Government to act up to their pledge unless they possessed the only opportunity which a free Parliament gave? The Government were also virtually pledged to deal with the amendment of the Compensation Act. There was a grave danger if they had no opportunity of discussing these matters that those pledges would be forgotten and others would take their place, with the result that those reforms which the country desired to possess would be rendered impossible of attainment simply because they would be no longer a free Parliament. They would have no sort of freedom about their deliberations during this autumn session The programme put before the House would run them right up to the beginning of the next financial year. Therefore they would find themselves a muzzled and dumb Parliament as regarded all the matters which they really desired to discuss, and they would be dealing with two Bills to which he believed the majority of the people were opposed, namely, the London Water Bill and the Education Bill. [Ministerial cries of "No, no."] He was convinced that that was the case, and they would test it pretty soon at the County Council Elections. The House would be tied up discussing these two measures only, and would be prevented from discussing any of those proposals which might more advantageously have been brought before the House.

(3.8.) MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) thought His Majesty's Government were, under the circumstances, fully justified in asking for the time of the House for the Education Bill. It was perfectly true, as alleged, that if the Government had taken the usual course they could have avoided this Motion. They could have done what other prudent Governments had done; they could have brought in their Bill at the commencement of the session and stuck to it to the end instead of dealing with the new Rules. But that was not done. That milk was spilt, and for the Education Bill the Government were fully entitled to ask the House to give precedence. The original design of the Bill was so good, and its promise so great of accepting all such compromises as would not destroy the Bill, that too much time could not be given to it. He hoped it was in the spirit of compromise that the measure would be conducted through the House. Under those circumstances, he thought the Government were entitled to ask for time. But were the Government entitled to all the time they were now asking for? It was barely six months ago that the House came to a new bargain about the Rules, made upon a Motion moved by himself and accepted by the First Lord of the Treasury. By that Motion the private Member would be entitled to about one quarter of the whole time of the House. Surely that was not a very large amount of time to leave to all the various matters which a private Member was entitled to raise. Perhaps in the course of this discussion the First Lord of the Treasury might be induced to still leave them Tuesday or Wednesday evening. If he did, then they would not suffer so much, and they would have an opportunity of raising matters of very considerable importance. Take, for instance, the Shipping Combine. The right hon. Gentleman had made no allusion to that, and at present the only means of raising a matter of so serious national importance would be by moving the adjournment. If His Majesty's Government asked for the time of the House for the purpose of the Education Bill alone he thought that, under the circumstances, they would be justified in that course, and the House would grant it. But that was not the case, for there were many Bills set down and promised. There was the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. Were they sure that that would not be discussed by hon. Members from Ireland and other hon. Gentlemen on the Liberal Benches? Then there was to be a resolution on the sugar bounties, and that would afford discussion for days upon days. The First Lord of the Treasury must be aware that the very greatest interest was taken in the question, for it raised the whole question of free trade and protection. Next, there was to be a Vote in Supply for the Transvaal. They had also to pass the Sessional Orders into Standing Orders, and that was an interminable job. The right hon. Gentleman must be aware that the time he had taken to pass the first and easiest part of the new Rules showed that he must look forward a protracted discussion. Then there was the Indian Budget. Had the right hon. Gentleman forgotten that on going into Committee on the Indian Budget there was the one opportunity offered of moving an Amendment to the Motion "that Mr. Speaker do leave the chair" and upon that Motion a very long and considerable discussion might take place. The right hon. Gentleman said that he was going to take Votes in Supply. That course involved the setting up again of Supply and the Motion "that Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair" on each class of Supply to be dealt with. He was not sure that this could be done under the new Supply Rule. He was not sure that the right hon. Gentleman appreciated the effect of it. He did not think the Government could not take extra days beyond the twenty-three already allotted. The Committee of Supply was closed and the Appropriation Act was passed, and it was contrary to all precedent under the circumstances to set up Supply again. He did not know whether this point had been considered by those who had been elevated to the Treasury Bench since the House last met, but he seriously committed this question to their attention. His belief was that as regarded Supply they could not set it up again. Such a course would be contrary to the Sessional Supply Order they had already passed. He believed that it was wholly unprecedented for any Minister to set up Supply in an Autumn end of a Session. It was not done in 1882 or in 1893, and what was not attempted then could not, he thought, be proposed now, either according to the ordinary Rules of the House or on account of the particular Rules which the House adopted this session. He thought His Majesty's Government would be well advised to restrict their business during this Session to the Education Bill, and to that alone, and he was perfectly convinced that they would have very considerable resistance to the Motion as it now stood. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean was certainly right in saying that the Motion as it stood would preclude the consideration of any of the forty days orders after two o'clock, because the Motion orders at the conclusion of Government busines Mr. Speaker to adjourn the House without Question put. As His Majesty's Government had come to this session with the set purpose of passing the Education Bill by making all those reasonable compromises which tender consciences might require, and which reason did not forbid, he thought the right hon. Gentleman would be well advised to restrict his demand for the time of the House to the Education Bill alone.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne, said he wanted to make an appeal to the Prime Minister with regard to the Indian Budget. It was of the very greatest importance that this question, should be discussed early in the session) and protests had always been made from time to time against its being delayed.

At this point the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) entered the House, and was received with hisses from the Irish Members.

*MR. SPEAKER said hon. Members making that noise must desist. Such a proceeding was quite unheard of.

MR. CAINE, resuming, said that those interested in the Indian Budget felt that, when the discussion was postponed, the House had not sufficient opportunity of expressing its opinion on the subject of Indian finance. The Indian Budget had in ordinary sessions been postponed to near the end, and if it was postponed now, until near Christmas Day, it would be absolutely impossible to have a discussion in this House with regard to the financial proposals of the Government. He did not remember any year in which there were so many events of burning interest which ought to be discussed in this House. There was one particular question which would have to be discussed—that of the Indian tea planters. Tea planting was one of the important industries of India, and in connection with that there was the question of forcing liquor shops on the tea planters against their will in order that the liquor might be consumed by the coolies. He hoped that the Prime Minister would arrange for the Indian Budget being taken before the 15th of next month. Such a course would give the greatest satisfaction not only to the increasing number of persons in this House who were taking an interest in Indian questions, but also to the people of India. The Secretary and the Under Secretary for India were now in this House, and two very long and important speeches would be made on behalf of the India Office. He hoped the Prime Minister would take into consideration the desire of those interested in Indian questions that he would give an early opportunity for their discussion.

(3.18.) MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN said that after the reply given to hon. Member for Kilkenny, the Premier would scarcely expect that this Motion would be accepted by the representatives of Ireland without whatever opposition they could give it. If the Motion were passed it would mean that so far as the Government were concerned five-sixths of the representatives of Ireland were to be gagged and closured for the entire period of this winter, while the Government were engaged in torturing their country to the very verge of revolt. It would be a better day's work perhaps for England, and possibly for the future of the existing Administration, if this were a Motion to give the entire time of the House to the affairs of Ireland. Instead of that they had not spent a single day in the whole of this prolonged session in remedying what they confessed to be the pressing necessities of Ireland, while they had wasted many a day in trying to still further silence the representatives of Ireland, and to wound and insult the feelings of the people. They were willing to spend any amount of time and money upon any subject or country on the face of the globe except that place of all others within their dominions which most required attention from Parliament. One fragment of a night was given, something like six months ago, to the affairs of Ireland, when a Land Bill was introduced. It had never been heard of since, and he was glad to learn from this morning's papers that it would never be heard of again. It was actually made a crime on the part of the Irish representatives that they did not immediately accept that Bill without demur, although the Chief Secretary for Ireland now publicly confessed in his speech last night at Bolton that that Bill would not settle the Irish land question, and that, in fact, no English Government could settle it. The right hon. Gentleman had not settled anything in Ireland, but he had unsettled everything there. In a way, Ireland possibly would be better deserving of the attention of this House than even the educational civil war in which the Government proposed to spend the winter. It was the duty of every Irish Member to solemnly warn every man—if there were any on the other side who had not made up their minds to support outrage—that the people's good-will would be of more value than all the people of the Rand, and to warn the House that the Chief Secretary, whose conduct they were not to discuss any more this winter, was creating a state of feeling among the Irish people wantonly and without a scrap of justification in the way of crime, without even believing himself in the policy of coercion he was carrying out. He was creating a feeling among the Irish people, and the Irish race, of revolution and of bitter indignation which the hon. Member did not care to dwell upon. He knew no more terrible indictment of the infatuation and the perfect hopelessness of English rule in Ireland than that this state of things was occurring in Ireland, when Parliament was asked and forced to turn the whole of its attention for the next four or five months to a matter which, though important, might have been disposed of if the Government had devoted to it the time wasted on the ridiculous new Rules, and if they had closed in good time with the compromise suggested by his hon. friend the Member for East Mayo. He would refer briefly to what was going on in Ireland. He would call no other witness than the Chief Secretary himself, who was in nominal command of the coercion campaign. The right hon. Gentleman had placed on record the now memorable declaration that what was going on in Ireland was a struggle between two great organisations—the landlords' organisation and the tenants' organisation—and that not he, not the Government, and not this House alone could bring the Irish land question to a satisfactory settlement.

*Mr. SPEAKER said these matters could not be debated on this Motion.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) asked whether it would be in order for the hon. Member to put down an Amendment that this particular topic should be discussed.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Whatever the Amendment proposed, it must be relevant to this Motion, and no Amendment would be in order which is not relevant to the Motion.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN said he anticipated the objection of Mr. Speaker. He was sure Mr. Speaker would allow him to say that his view was that the Chief Secretary had practically thrown up the sponge as to the Government of Ireland, and that the right hon. Gentleman was simply going blind in the affairs of that country. His subordinates in Ireland were carrying on the Government in the most unconstitutional and barbarous way, and this was a matter of far more urgency and importance to England, as well as Ireland, than even the Education Bill. It must be remembered that if this Motion were passed they should have still two days in each week on which it would be possible for them to press these matters on the attention of the House; and in order to justify their claim for the retention of these two days, he respectfully submitted that it ought not to be made impossible for the Irish Members to go into some of the particulars of the unjustifiable state of the Government of Ireland in order to illustrate the state of Ireland. No further did he intend to go.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I observe that the hon. Member is desirous to comply with the Rules of the House; but it is impossible for me to permit an argument of that kind on this Motion. The hon. Member will see that if that were not so, any hon. Member might say, "I object to this Motion because the Education Bill is so bad that I wish to alter it, and I wish, in order to illustrate my argument, to make a Second Reading speech." I regret that the Rules of the House prevent me from allowing the hon. Member to proceed in that direction.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I submit that after the words in the Motion "for the remainder of the session, Government Business do have precedence at every sitting," there might be inserted, "except those days when any Bill or Motion relating to the affairs of Ireland is set down."

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member could not discuss upon that Motion the action of the Chief Secretary for Ireland.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN said he did not intend to controvert the ruling of Mr. Speaker. He was sure these new Rules had brought more trouble to Mr. Speaker than to the Irish Members. His experience in this House was that in the older times and under the older Rules there was still something like free speech.

*MR. SPEAKER: I did not say that this is any new Rule. These Motions for the Government taking the time of House have been made for many many years in this House, and upon all occasions no debate of the kind the hon. Member is proposing to initiate would have been in order.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN said he should not contest the matter further. [Laughter from the Government Benches, and cries of "Order!" and a voice: "The Education of England!"] That was simply the kind of thing which made Englishmen loved in Ireland [Loud cheers from the Irish Benches.] He simply desired to state that if this Motion was rejected by the House, if they still got time to address this House on the grievances of Ireland, it would be perfectly easy for them to show—and that was the lines of the argument he urged as against this Motion—that what was going on in Ireland was not a war against crime, but a war against public opinion, against the whole mass of the elected representatives of the people of every category—of Parliament, of Corporations, of County Councils, and of District Councils. They should be able to show the House that the Government were doing absolutely a new thing, the most unwarrantable thing in the whole history of Ireland, in imposing such a tyranny on a country which was without any crime or bloodshed, and on a question in which the Chief Secretary himself confessed that the Irish Members were in the right and their opponents in the wrong.. But this he would say: that the Government might cut themselves out of the opportunity of discussing these things here, as well as in Ireland; they might sit on the safety valve; but they knew very little of Irish nature, or indeed of ordinary human nature, if they imagined that they could go on in that way without raising a spirit for which their worst enemies, perhaps, would thank them.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) said he had no objection to the proposal of the Prime Minister, but in the discussion which had taken place in regard to the subjects on which the House was to occupy the autumn there had been no reference to one which appeared to him to be of urgent importance, in which time was a chief factor, and one which affected great public and private interests. He meant the subject of the Savings Banks. A Select Committee on Savings Banks sat last session under the chairmanship of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—and attention was given to the question of the deficiency which existed, and would be largely increased, after the automatic reduction of the interest on Consols in 1903. The Committee recommended that there should be a reduction of the interest paid by the State to the Savings Banks to the extent of an-eighth per cent., and also several administrative reforms. The Savings Banks year commenced and ended in November, and he could hardly conceive it possible that there could be legislation afterwards of a retrospective character, which would be injurious to the banks and most inconvenient to the large bodies of the depositors. He suggested this matter to the Government for their consideration, though personally he had not favoured any reduction of interest, and did not desire it or think it absolutely necessary, and asked them to say whether, and if so when, they proposed to deal with this question, which affected both the State and private individuals to a large extent. He believed that the result of the Government failing to say this definitely would lead to uncertainty, which already existed, and which was highly disadvantageous to the people, and to the greatest inconvenience on the part of the bank managers. Inasmuch as time was of the greatest importance in this regard, and if legislation was to take effect next year, the latter must be accomplished soon, so as to give ample notice to all concerned, and the House should be informed what the Government meant to do.

(3.38.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that before coming to the question of the Education Bill, he wished to refer in a few words to two other points. Shortly before the adjournment he had asked the Prime Minister or the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to the Vote for the Transvaal, and was informed that that would not be necessary at all. He was very glad to hear that the Government had changed their mind, and that an opportunity would be given to discuss that Vote. He had also asked a Question as to the pecuniary grant that was to be made to the Cunard Company. He did not understand from the right hon. Gentleman whether any opportunity would be given for discussing that matter. He hoped, however, that if a grant of money were to be made to the Cunard Company such an opportunity for discussing it would be afforded in the present session. But, after all, they had been summoned together to proceed primarily with the discussion of the Education Bill. ["Hear, hear!" from the Government Benches.] That cheer was a very feeble one, which, he thought, was rather indicative of the measure of the support which the Bill would receive, and that was one of the reasons why he was going to oppose the Motion before the House. What was the position they were in? Here was a Bill of which they had disposed of two pages, and which they had yet to go over again; while there were still seventy pages of Amendments to dispose of. Looking to the number of those Amendments the Bill was on the "wrong grass," to use the phrase of a right hon. Gentleman opposite—even if this were a Bill which the country really demanded. [An HON. MEMBER on the Government Benches: "It does."] The interruption came from an hon. representative of a constituency to which the Bill did not apply; that was a London Member. This was a Bill that clearly nobody wanted. He was perfectly certain that the Prime Minister did not want it, and that the right hon. Gentleman would be very glad if he had never had anything to do with it. And yet the House was asked to give facilities for it, to the exclusion of every other subject, such, for instance, as the condition of Ireland, which was one of the most important topics which the House could discuss. He did not think any Government had the right to press through the House of Commons a Bill like this, and ask for extra facilities for practically five months. Any Parliamentarian who went through the Amendments on the Paper must come to the conclusion that if the Prime Minister wished to force through the Bill he could not do so without the use of the closure, which would be monstrously unfair, before March next year. [Ministerial cries of "No, no!"] He asked hon. Members who had taken the same trouble to go through the Amendments as he had done, whether they must not come to the conclusion that there was great substance in them and that they must be fully discussed, especially when the state of public feeling in the country in regard to them was considered? [An HON. MEMBER on the Ministerial Benches: "No."] That was the voice of another Member for London; but he asked Members for constituencies which the Bill affected whether they imagined that their constituencies really wanted the Bill, and whether, on the contrary, they would not prefer that it should be put off? He asked the Prime Minister to take into account the health of his supporters. He had been reading every day in the columns of the *Morning Post* a long list of casualties, and he found that these supporters were breaking down under the strain. Already they had leave to take rest of from six weeks to three months. An hon. Gentleman on the other side who supported the Nonconformist view on this Bill had so considerably broken down under the strain that he had booked a passage to the West Indies and he had had to find an under-study. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bordesley would take up the *rôle*, now that he was out of employment. He cautioned the Prime Minister not to put an intolerable strain on his supporters to go against the wishes of their constituents, in the endeavour to pass a Bill which nobody asked for, for which the Government had no mandate, and for which the country had, by every constitutional method, indicated its clear antipathy. Certain hon. Members opposite questioned that statement. They must have spent the recess out of the country and therefore had not been convinced; let them look at all the indications, not merely at the great demonstrations, the great public meetings, but all the indications. They had the greatest test as to whether the noisy fanatics at these meetings were the majority of the opponents of the Bill or whether they were the minority, in the remarkable character of the recent elections. How many hon. Members opposite had been addressing public demonstrations in support of the Bill? He observed that during the last few days they had been exhorting each other and saying "we must do something to support the Government," but that was rather an exhortation to someone else to go on and do something. He did not observe that those gentlemen addressed meetings themselves. They had had private meetings in support of the Bill, but even in Birmingham they could not hold a public meeting in support, not even when the Colonial Secretary addressed it himself! That was a remarkable indication in itself, but the arguments used by the Colonial Secretary with regard to the Bill showed that he clearly realised that his own supporters were against it. He did not say "this Bill is a good one," but "if you do not carry this Bill I will resign," and then he said "and mark the consequences. There shall be neither dew nor rain in the British Empire for seven long years," and a shudder passed over the Birmingham Liberal Unionists which lasted for four resolutions. They then recovered themselves, and another resolution was passed, which resulted in a terrible threat being used. Another meeting took place, when the only argument used was that the Bill was opposed by the Pro-Boers. The Liberal Unionists then in the House, who addressed that meeting, did not like the Bill and could not say much for it, but said "we have got to stick together or there will be a dissolution." When such a condition of things existed, when every constitutional method had been exhausted by the country to show that it disagreed with this measure, and whilst on the other hand nobody wanted the Bill except perhaps the Church, no Government had a right without a mandate from the people to misappropriate the trust funds of the State for such a purpose. It was a revolution in the educational system of the country; it offended the convictions of millions of the best citizens of the land, and without an express mandate the Government had no right to legislate upon it. Where a case of great urgency arose and it became necessary to legislate immediately, an Autumn Session might be summoned and the whole time given to that legislation, but even then if the country rose against it, as it had risen against the Education Bill, such legislation could not be proceeded with. The Government should go to the country and say "We have got to get this Bill through and we come to you for your judgment upon it." It was only the great personal popularity of the Prime Minister which would enable this Bill to be carried, but the right hon. Gentleman had no right to use his personal popularity for the purpose of flouting the opinion of the country and taking advantage of a verdict obtained on another issue for the purpose of carrying through a Bill against the wishes of thousands of the people who placed him in power. He did not think the House of Commons ought to give the right hon. Gentleman any privilege for doing anything of the kind. The Prime Minister, in his opinion, was not entitled to call upon the House to sit for four or five months and suspend the ordinary operation of the Rules of the House for the purpose of forcing through this Bill.

(3.55.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) said as the right hon. Gentleman had spoken upon the subject of the Estimates which he purposed to ask for this year, he desired to know whether the right hon. Gentleman had considered the bearing of the new Rule passed upon the subject: "Any additional Estimate for any new matter not included in the Estimates for the year shall be submitted for consideration in Committee of Supply on some day not exceeding two days before the Committee is closed." So far as he could read the Rule, it appeared to him that it would debar the production of new Estimates after the Committee of Supply was closed. It was a very unusual practice to close Committee of Supply in the middle of a session, but it was done in 1893, and the late Lord Randolph Churchill took the objection at the time, that after the Committee was closed no further business of that character could be brought forward. He (Sir William Harcourt) expressed the opinion then that such a proposition could not be maintained. But that was not a question of bringing forward new Estimates, and he thought he was right in saying that no question was ever raised of introducing new Estimates after Committee of Supply had been closed. Having listened to what the hon. Member for King's Lynn had said, which he thought was well founded, he had come to the conclusion that the Rule did include new Estimates to be brought forward after the Committee of Supply had been closed. As this was the middle of the session and it was a matter of great importance that the finances of the country should be safeguarded, it would be as well to know whether the right hon. Gentleman had considered the matter.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman has asked me a question in reference to a matter raised by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, which deals with a point on which I should not like to give a conclusive opinion now, nor is it relevant really to this discussion. I was asked to make a general statement as to the views of the Government in regard to business, and I explained to the House that one of the things we ought to deal with was the necessity of finding money for the Transvaal, and possibly also for the Uganda Railway. I think a statement to that effect was made by my noble friend the Under Secretary at an earlier period of the session. With regard to the need for finding money for the Transvaal, that, as the House knows, arises directly out of the arrangements come to at the time peace was signed. I indicated to the House the method which I think ought to be pursued; I will consider any difficulty that has been raised in the course of this debate, and the proper time to discuss those difficulties will be when the Government make their definite proposals on those subjects to the House. The right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean wanted to know whether it would be possible—probable, at least—should an occasion arise, to have a discussion on one of those resolutions which by Statute have to lie forty days on the Table of the House. I think by a practice known to the House, it would be possible if that should be necessary. An appeal was made to me by an hon. Gentleman opposite not only to bring on the Indian Budget early, but, I think, to devote two days or more to it. I think that is a somewhat excessive demand on the time of the House. I do not at all say that the subject is not one of great importance, but after all, we must cut our coat according to our cloth, and we must have some proportion in the time allowed to the various subjects under discussion. I cannot hold out hope to the hon. Gentleman that I should gladly or willingly see two days devoted to the Indian Budget.

MR. CAINE: Would the right hon. Gentleman say whether it will be taken early?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have consulted my noble friend the Secretary of State for India as to when it will be brought in, but I do not know what great gain is to be obtained by an early discussion of the subject. My hon. friend the Member for South Islington asked me whether we ought not to introduce a Bill this year dealing with the difficulty which undoubtedly will arise when the rate of interest on Consols is compulsorily reduced, as I think it will be on the 1st April next. That, no doubt, does raise a question of importance in relation to the interest to be paid to Savings Bank depositors; but I gather from my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer that it will not be necessary to deal with that matter at present. May I say in regard to the general statement as to the business to be taken, that while I have endeavoured to indicate to the House the business, other than the Education Bill or the Water Bill, which we ought to take, I must not be held to pledge the Government not to deal with public necessities should public necessities arise. I am not giving a pledge to the House or the country on this subject. I am indicating the general intention of the Government, and I hope it will be distinctly understood on all sides of the House that the Government will ask the House to deal with anything else that it is pressingly and obviously necessary in the public interest should be immediately dealt with. The only general pledge I give to the House is that it will not be asked to discuss general legislative questions which, however interesting or important, can be deferred to a subsequent session. I believe, in that connection, I ought to mention in the first place a one-clause Bill which my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War will introduce and explain in good time, and which he tells me ought to be passed without any undue delay. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Carnarvon Boroughs opposed this Motion on the ground that the country, in his opinion, dislikes the Education Bill. I am not going to enter into the question as to whether the country likes or dislikes that Bill, or as to whether it will like it more when it knows more about it, or as to whether the Bill will grow in favour or grow in disfavour. These are questions which any man may estimate and may judge for himself, but I absolutely deny the constitutional principle which the hon. Gentleman has laid down, which is that this House is incapable of dealing with any measure if a certain number of Gentlemen express their own opinion that the country dislikes it. May I call the attention of the House to the extraordinary difference in the principle which appears to animate hon. Gentlemen when they are dealing with the present situation, and the principle which animated these very hon. Gentlemen when they were dealing with the position of public business in 1893-4. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen, on behalf of the Opposition, did attempt to draw a parallel between the present situation and the situation in 1893, very much to the advantage of the situation in 1893. He said that it was quite true that the Government of that day asked the House to re-assemble in the autumn, but it was not in order to discuss a controversial Bill, but in order to discuss the Parish Councils Bill, which, passed its Second Reading without a division. That I believe is quite a true statement of fact. But how did the Government of 1893 ever get to the position which enabled them to devote an autumn session to a Bill which was not opposed on its Second Reading? They did it by closuring in compartments the Home Rule Bill months earlier. If we had adopted that operation in regard to the Education Bill, we need not have had an autumn session at all for a Bill either controversial or uncontroversial. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Carnarvon Boroughs thinks that our procedure in this matter should be regulated by his estimate of the popular favour held by the constituencies for the moment in reference to the Education Bill. I do not know whether he thinks that the Home Rule Bill was so passionately liked by the constituencies that it was proper and right for those then in charge of the business of the House to take the course they did. I hardly think the hon. Gentleman would take up that position.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: They were elected on that issue, after all. This Government was not elected to deal with education; it was elected for the war.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman raises that issue, I would ask what he thinks of the Home Rule Bill introduced in 1886. It does seem to me that the right hon. Gentleman opposite is adopting a very extravagant position when he says that the Government of 1893 were justified in prolonging the session, because the Bill they asked the House to consider was not divided against on the Second Reading, when the only method by which the Government ever reached that relatively favourable position in regard to public business was by closuring in compartments the Home Rule Bill in the preceding July. The only other observation of an argumentative character which I think I need make is that arising out of the claim made by a great many hon. Gentlemen opposite that, although we have met for the purpose, in the main, of dealing with the Education Bill this autumn, we ought to leave the ordinary arrangements for private Members' business as if this were an ordinary part of an ordinary session. There can be no justification for a practice so absolutely novel. Never has Parliament put upon itself the great strain of meeting in the autumn to finish measures which could not be completed during the early part of the session, without giving to the Government the facilities for which we now ask. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean will, I think, admit the historical accuracy of what I say; but if I understood his speech aright, he contends that a new principle or a new practice has been introduced by the new Rules of the House. He asks, having regard to the pledges and the statement of policy made by myself in introducing these Rules, and inasmuch as I had stated my hope with reference to the new Rules that however much they might interfere with the paper privileges of unofficial Members, the real privileges of unofficial Members would be greatly augmented, how was it consistent with that general undertaking that I gave when I asked the House to reform or to revolutionise its proceedings. If the right hon. Gentleman will turn to the report in *Hansard* he will see that an Amendment was discussed which makes it necessary for me to make this Motion today, and without which this Motion would not have been made. That Amendment was supported from the other side of the House, and I accepted it with reluctance, but I distinctly stated:—

> "The universal experience of the House had shown that when the House met for an autumn session after an adjournment it met to finish up Government Bills." [(4) *Debates*, cv., 1491.]

Although I did not think it an improvement on the Rule, I had no objection to accepting, for the sake of peace and of the progress of the discussion of the Rule, an Amendment which could be disposed of at the beginning of the autumn session at no unreasonable length. I think that is all I need say on the argumentative part of the speeches which have been delivered, and the only additional observation that I think it necessary to make is as to the length of time we have devoted——

MR. BRYCE: What about ordinary business?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot give any pledge with regard to ordinary business. The main business every week will be the Education Bill. No doubt there will be evening sittings, and possibly an occasional morning sitting, at which other business will be taken. I cannot give any general programme on that subject, but the general policy of the Government is plain. The Education Bill is what, in the main, we have met to deal with, and to that the main bulk of our time must be devoted.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): When will the Water Bill be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It will be taken, with the other measures to which I have referred, when we are not taking the Education Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: What about the Cunard subsidy?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that no Estimate will be required for that this year. So I am informed. I suppose there will be an Estimate next year. May I ask the House now to consent to bring the debate to a conclusion? May I read one sentence from the speech of the hon. Member for Waterford, who was addressing himself to the Amendment to the Rule to which I have referred? I am quoting from the same page of *Hansard.* The hon. Member said—

> "The right hon. Gentleman said that Parliament never met under those circumstances except to discuss some business which was so urgent that the whole House was anxious to discuss it, and to devote all their time to it. Suppose that was the case, why should the Government be afraid of having a discussion under those circumstances which could not last more than a couple of hours."

That was the estimate of the hon. Member for Waterford as to the length of time this discussion should take. I commend it to the House as a very reasonable estimate of the length of time this discussion should take, and I ask the House, whether hon. Gentlemen approve of the Education Bill or not, whether they think it ought to be dropped or not, to admit that if it is to be considered the Government must have facilities. Surely it is waste of time to debate these preliminaries at greater length, and I earnestly suggest that we should as soon as possible deal with the main subject which has called us together—I mean the discussion of the remaining clauses of the Education Bill.

(4.15.) MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said the House must have been surprised at the entire omission from the right hon. Gentleman's speech of any reference to Ireland. The hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs had spoken of the feeling of England with regard to the present Government. That was a matter he would leave to English Members, but as to the opinion of Ireland he would simply point the right hon. Gentleman to the first chapter of Revelations, where reference was made to the Church of the Laodiceans. What was there said would happen to those who were neither hot nor cold very well represented the physical proceeding which in a political form the people of Ireland would inflict upon the present Government if they had the opportunity. The present debate had had an instructive prologue. The hon. Member for the City of Cork had asked for a day for the discussion of the condition of Ireland. To that request one of the most extraordinary answers ever given in the House of Commons had been returned. It was not a denial of the gravity of the condition of Ireland, but a promise that if the demand were made, not by representatives of Ireland, but by the representative of an English party, it would be granted. And yet the right hon. Gentleman spoke of the "doctrines of Separatists!" What would have been said if Wales were in a condition approaching revolution, and the leader of the Welsh Members, on asking for a day for the discussion of the condition of that country, had been told that the request would be granted only if made by an Englishman or a Scotsman? He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the Irish party had been in alliance with more than one party in the House of Commons. It was an alliance which had been sometimes injurious and sometimes beneficial; it had been injurious to a Party which honestly took up the cause of Ireland, and beneficial to a Party which hypocritically attempted to use the Irish Party for its own purposes. But when the Prime Minister and the Members of the Fourth Party were hunting in couples with the Irish Parnellite Party, and secret interviews and secret understandings were taking place, the Irish Members were not called the slaves of their Tory allies. Nor were they the slaves of the Liberals today. The Liberals did not want to impose their official position upon the Irish Party, and if they did the Irish Members would not accept it. They simply demanded in the name of Ireland a day for the discussion of the condition of their country, and it was an additional insult to Ireland to say that that demand would be refused when made by the representatives of Ireland, but granted if put forward by an English Party. So far as the Government could carry out its policy the voice of National Ireland was stifled. If public meetings were held, the police dispersed them. If public men made speeches, the Chief Secretary called in two of his despicable tools from Dublin Castle—tools as base as those who did to death the Lord Edward Fitzgerald whose blood ran in the right hon. Gentleman's veins. The successors of Major Sirr had been used by a Geraldine for the purpose of putting into prisons a Geraldine's political opponents. The voice of Irish representatives was being stifled in jail by sentences which England alone passed upon political offenders, and these methods were being employed against political opponents by one who ran round the House asking Irish Members to support a request to put into a different category prisoners of his own political persuasion—men who were indeed political offenders, but men on whose souls rested the guilt of as bloody and unjust a war as ever devastated a country.

*Mr. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Member that the present was not an occasion for discussing generally the policy of the Government in Ireland.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said he was not discussing the policy of the Government in Ireland; he was discussing the state of Ireland, and urging that as a reason for demanding time for discussion, instead of Irish representatives being gagged.

*Mr. SPEAKER said he had already explained the limits within which that might be done. The hon. Member was not at liberty to debate the question of Ireland. He was entitled to urge that time should not be taken by the Government because it left no opportunity for discussing the needs of Ireland, but he was not entitled to go in detail into the question, otherwise every question which could possibly be the subject of a Motion or Bill could be discussed on the present Motion.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR repeated that he was not discussing the policy of the Government, he was discussing the state of Ireland, just as a Welsh Member had been permitted to discuss the state of England.

*Mr. SPEAKER pointed out that the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs had commented on the statement of the First Lord that time was asked for the consideration of the Education Bill, and he argued that time ought not to be granted because the Bill was unpopular. He had then given reasons for stating the Bill was unpopular. But that was a totally different thing from what the hon. Member for Scotland Division was doing, for the hon. Member, on the question of the time of the House being taken by the Government, was proposing to discuss the condition of Ireland.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said he thought that if the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs was allowed to discuss the popularity of the Education Bill in this country, certainly he might be allowed to say something of the popularity of the Government in a country where the constitution was suspended. However, he did not want to even approach anything like a controversy with the Chair, because its authority must be preserved in an assembly like the House of Commons, and he would pass the matter by simply with the observation that he had sometimes longed to be a Welshman but he never longed so much as he did now. What was the position of the Prime Minister with regard to their demand? Their demand was so fair, modest and urgent, and so required by the necessities of the case that he thought the right hon. Gentleman would have been ashamed to refuse it. Their demand was that as the Government had silenced the Irish people, as far as they could, at least in this great Parliament the voice of Ireland might be heard. The right hon. Gentleman opposite was always telling them that they could get full justice for Ireland in Parliament, and that they could get more justice from an English Parliament than on the floor of an Irish Assembly. They came to the House with Ireland coerced and gagged, and they asked for one day to have the condition of the country discussed, but the Prime Minister replied that if a mere Irishman made the demand it would be refused, but if the demand had the sanction and patronage of one of the superior races then the request would be granted and Ireland would be heard. He was not sorry for the incidents of this debate. He was not sorry for the words used that afternoon, by whomsoever spoken, for they carried their lesson. They had had a brief debate, but it would be a fruitful one, and if Ireland had any doubt of its right and its duty to appeal from this unjust House and this unjust Government to a House and Government of its own people, then the Irish people were too blind to read the signs which were clearly written on the wall.

*MR. T. M. HEALY said he rose for the purpose of saying a few words upon the subject of the Uganda Railway. (Laughter.) In this he was greatly encouraged by the flattering way in which the subject was received by the House. Speaking as a native of Uganda, he wished to thank the Government for the great measure of advance they had made in Uganda, which he was sure would bring calm to Kerry and balm to Ballydehob. He thanked the Government for the proposed expenditure upon that country of further millions of public money and for proposing to take up the time of the House, as promised by the Prime Minister, with further discussions on this project. When he contemplated the condition of portions of the Empire he could not help felicitating the Government upon the proposal to spend time and money upon the inhabitants of that distant and neglected island at a time of great stringency when the Education Bill was exciting so much passion! There must be some reason for this flattering attention which Uganda had received. He believed it was a perfectly crimeless country. Its administration was in the hands of the most virtuous "removables" the British Empire could afford. There law and order proceeded with a regularity of which they had no example in this country, and hence it was that, at a moment when Party passions had been roused to their highest pitch, the British Parliament was prepared to turn aside from mere paltry topics such as the affairs of Ireland, England, Scotland and Wales, and devote itself with one voice to the necessities of the people of that afflicted area. The Prime Minister was new to his office, but, by his promise to Uganda, he had given a pledge to the Empire at large which would resound through Australia, Canada, and through every Colony and Republic absorbed by England, assuring distant peoples that however much this Parliament, which they were told only yesterday devoted so much time to sticking pins in pin cushions, might have its hands full yet if they had a nigger, a painted savage, or a heathen roaming in in the woods, the Prime Minister of England still had a tear at his disposal, and was prepared to appeal to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to pour out the gold of England for the benefit of benighted mankind. Irish Members had long gloried in being Members of this Parliament and might now take comfort in the destruction of their own Parliament, for could they imagine within the narrow walls of an Irish Parliament such disinterestedness. When their own country was palpitating with emotion, could they imagine an Irish Parliament showing such altruism and turning aside to contemplate the condition of Uganda? No, it was here alone that they could contemplate such unselfishness. Irish Members would return to their own country, elevated and ennobled by the reflection, that though Connaught might be desolate and Munster miserable this House at least had a watchful care for the people of Uganda.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said Irishmen were invited to leave the discussion of their own affairs, which at present were being run under the Coercion Act, to come here and listen to discussions on the English Education Bill, which seemed to satisfy nobody, not even the Prime Minister. His hon. and learned friend the Member for North Louth had discussed the question of the further advances to the Uganda Railway, and the question of squandering further sums on the trackless sands of African deserts. He proposed to move an Amendment dealing with a specific question, and it was this. This was a most unseasonable time to withdraw from the consideration of Parliament proceedings in Ireland, which were absolutely unique and unprecedented in Irish history. Here there were 86 members out of 670, who charged the Government of the day with violating the fundamental principles of the constitution in Ireland, and the only answer was, "No, we gag you in Ireland and we gag you on the floor of the House of Commons." What were the Government afraid of? Were they ashamed of the removable magistrates? Were they afraid of an exposure being made of the abuse and prostitution of the forms of law which at present obtained in Ireland? They were afraid of it. If not, they would not hesitate to give a day or two for the discussion of this exceptional state of things. It had been said that in former times the excuse for coercion was that a state of crime and outrage prevailed. Not even the most hardened Member of the Cabinet had the face and the effrontery to make that statement now, and yet savage, vindictive, contemptible, and cruel sentences were being passed on public men in Ireland for what were called offences—men against whom no moral stigma was attached. The most powerful Government of modern times were afraid to give a few hours for the discussion of a state of things which was fomented by their own agents, and which was a disgrace to the Empire. It would be a disgrace to the most oppressive tyranny that ever oppressed a people. The representatives of Ireland did not make any considerable demand on the time of the House, but they did demand that if this violation of the constitution was to continue, they should not be denied for months time and opportunity for exposing what they denounced as the cruel wrongs under which Ireland was at the present moment suffering through the practical suspension of the constitutional rights and guarantees of the people. He moved his Amendment as a protest against the action of the Government, on behalf of the Irish Parliamentary Party and the Irish people. If the Government did not accept the Amendment, it was a plain declaration to Ireland that they were afraid to discuss the dirty work their tools were doing in that country.

Amendment proposed—

"After the word 'Sitting,' to insert the words 'except at such Sitting for which Motions dealing with proceedings under The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887 are set down, and which, but for this Motion, would have precedence."—(*Mr. Flynn.*)

Debate arising.

*Mr. DELANY (Queen's Co., Ossory) seconded the Amendment. It occurred to him that almost any subject may be discussed in this House except the condition of Ireland. In the programme the Prime Minister had put before the House for the Autumn Session he had omitted one very important measure. The right hon. Gentleman had not been unmindful of public opinion in England and Wales in regard to the Education Bill. The Nonconformists had declared that they would strike against the rate if the Education Bill were passed in its present form. Did the Prime Minister propose to pass a Coercion Act for England and Wales, or did he propose to extend to them the Jubilee Coercion Act at present in force in Ireland? That appeared to be one great flaw in the proposal of the Prime Minister. He was sure the Chief Secretary would be obliging enough to give him a dozen removable magistrates to enforce the Education Act in England. Ireland could afford to lose them. Members of Parliament were sent to prison for the action they took on behalf of their countrymen, and yet their colleagues were denied the opportunity of discussing the state of affairs in Ireland. They were supposed to live under the British Constitution, but the British Constitution did not exist in Ireland. To all intents and purposes they might as well live under the Turk. They would be better in Russia, because there there was only one despot. In Ireland he did not know how many despots there were. Besides the Chief Secretary there were Lord Cranbrock, Lord Abercorn and Lord Barrymore, and he could name half-a-dozen other despots. Give him Russian or Turkish rule. He had a greater stake in Ireland than the Chief Secretary, and he had nothing to gain by outrage and crime. The greatest enemy of law and order in Ireland was the man who sowed the seed which must inevitably lead to disorder. There was order now because the national movement had brought the people from other courses and made them put their confidence in the national struggle. The present course pursued by the Government in Ireland was calculated to drive the people to desperation.

(4.50) Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman will not be surprised at my not being able to accept the Amendment proposed. The hon. Member for the Scotland Division has expressed surprise that I have made no reference to what has been said earlier in the debate in regard to Ireland. It escaped my memory, and it was not due to discourtesy of any kind to the Gentleman who discussed that subject. It is not correct to say that there will be no opportunity for debates on Ireland at all during the latter part of the present year. If an occasion should arise which seems to require debate, the power remains with the hon. Gentleman to move the adjournment of the House. I was surprised to hear the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen say that that power was now limited. It is not more limited now than it was in 1893. The limitation of which he spoke was that which arises out of the rulings of successive Speakers that the adjournment of the House cannot be moved on any subject with regard to which there is a Motion on the Paper.

Mr. BRYCE said his point was that in 1893 no use was made of the Rule under which Motions for the Adjournment of the House were ruled out by putting on the Paper a Motion dealing with the same question.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the right hon. Gentleman is mistaken. Nor do I think that the Rule to which he has referred has been used to prevent Motions for the adjournment of the House. My memory does not recall a single case in which the discussion of an Irish grievance has been prevented by the fact of a Motion being placed on the Paper. Therefore, at all events so far as Ireland is concerned, I do not think there has been any encroachment on the rights—sometimes in my opinion greatly abused, sometimes greatly taken advantage of—in connection with moving the adjournment of the House. It is only necessary for me to say in connection with the Amendment before the House that it would be a total violation of the practice of all former Governments in the case of Autumn Sessions. It would be in itself highly inconvenient, and I do not think it is necessary that we should debate the Amendment which the hon. Gentleman has moved. Even without the Amendment there will be far greater opportunities afforded for the discussion of Irish grievances in the Autumn Session than if the Government had followed the usual procedure and had not had an Autumn Session at all.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I only wish to express my strong opinion, after the discussion we have had in this House, that the Irish Members have a right to a day for the discussion of the condition of Ireland, which, as we know, is at present under the Coercion Act. It is a fact that there is need at the present time for the early discussion of the condition of affairs in Ireland. The question is whether the Irish representatives appearing in the House of Commons should or should not have the right to state their case in this Autumn Session. In my opinion they have that right and ought to be supported, and so far as regards my vote, at all events, it will be given in favour of their having the opportunity. The Government have got at their disposal the time of the House. Of course the right hon. Gentleman said in his speech that the Government were going to deal with an important subject. [A Hon. Member: "Uganda."]

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Let the hon. Gentleman wait till he sees what the Uganda Vote really is.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Whatever importance attaches to the case of Uganda, the case of suspension of the ordinary law in Ireland is still more important and is very urgent. It is a subject on which the people of England, as well as those of Ireland, ought to be satisfied as to its necessity, just as much as in the case of martial law. Martial law is justified where the necessity is proved to the people of the country, and the people of this country ought to be satisfied as to the necessity of the suspension of the ordinary law in Ireland. The Government can easily give time for the purpose of an Irish sitting in which the Irish Members may have an opportunity of stating their case. In my opinion it is just and fair that they should be given that opportunity, and therefore I shall vote in favour of any Motion which has that effect.

Mr. LEAMY (Kildare, N.) said that the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister seemed to think that he had disposed of the Irish claim for a day to discuss the condition of Ireland when he said that if there had not been an Autumn Session the Irish Members would not have been there. Why were they there? They had their own Parliament, of which England had robbed them; and now that they were in the Imperial Parliament they had the same rights as the right hon. the Member for Dover. That right hon. Gentleman, however, had gone over to Ireland, and with the assistance of his removable magistrates had caused ten Members of this House to be arrested, and in some cases imprisoned, because they had made political speeches displeasing to him. The Prime Minister had said that, because he wanted to pass an Education Bill for England, the Irish Members had no right to open their mouths for Ireland. But they would open their mouths for Ireland, and he told the right hon. Gentleman that he would be sick and sore at heart for the refusal which he had given that day to their demand. The right hon. Gentleman thought he could stifle the voice of Ireland. Before the session was many days older the Leader of the Irish Party, which represented five-sixths of the people of Ireland, would be addressing the representatives of 20 millions of the Irish race in the first free city of America, and he told the right hon. Gentleman that the most eloquent speech which the Leader of the Irish Party would make to that assemblage would not be half so eloquent proof of the injustice done by England to Ireland as the speech of the right hon. Gentleman in this House today. Attempts had formerly been made to drive discontent under the surface in Ireland, and he did not think they had ever been too successful. It was not often they saw two Irishmen on the Front Bench opposite. There were now two right hon. Gentlemen there who had known Ireland for more than twenty years, and he could not believe that the Solicitor General for England or the Attorney General for Ireland agreed that the Prime Minister was acting wisely in refusing to give Ireland a day. The Education Bill had been exciting great commotion in England. He had been reading the newspapers, which it was said the Prime Minister never did, and therefore he was in a position to be better acquainted with the feeling in England than the right hon. Gentleman. He had been reading speeches made by people of high position—some by clergymen, some by Members of Parliament, some by men distinguished in various walks of life, and he found that many of them had called upon their constituencies and the people to combine and refuse to pay rates. Now, rent was no more sacred than rates; but if two or three Members of Parliament, or others, stood on a platform in Ireland, and called upon the people not to pay rent, the Member for Dover came along with his "removables," and hauled them up under a charge of conspiracy, and sent them to prison with hard labour. Yet in England they could combine to defy the law and refuse to pay the rates with impunity. He would like to see the right hon. Gentleman venture to bring down a brace of "removables" to any constituency in England for the purpose of arresting and imprisoning any Member of this House. He was inclined to thank the Prime Minister for doing something to compel the Irish Members to realise that which, perhaps, they had not yet fully recognised—the degradation of being governed by this House. Thank God the right hon. Gentleman had given them an eye-opener. There were at present in Ireland some people who thought that what was necessary for the preservation of Ireland was to keep the right hon. Gentleman in power, but he thanked the right hon. Gentleman for ringing the knell of English Government in Ireland. He denied that any justice was to be got for Ireland from a Tory Government. The Prime Minister, who had pitched the right hon. Member for Dover into his Cabinet, had stood idly by when the latter dragged Irish Members to prison for exercising the right of free speech. He could not help saying that the right hon. Gentleman had done a good thing for Ireland by his speech tonight. That speech would be flashed across to America, and would do good there also, because it showed that the right hon. Gentleman had been stifling the ventilation of the grievances of Ireland.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: A point was raised almost at the beginning of our proceedings tonight which is relevant to the

Amendment now under discussion, and to which I venture to draw the attention of the First Lord of the Treasury. The point is that some ten or more Members of this House have been withdrawn from the service of the House by sentence of Courts of Law. As to the constitution of those Courts I make no remark at all; they are Courts sitting by the authority of Acts of Parliament: but it is an extraordinary circumstance that, for the first time so far as I understand, Members have been withdrawn from the service of the House without any communication of the fact being made to this House by Mr. Speaker. Whether I can put it so high as to assert that this House has a right to exact instantaneous reports to this House of the withdrawal of Members from the service of the House, I am not in a position to say; but this I can certainly state, from my own experience, which is not inconsiderable, that if there is not such a right it is an established custom. Plenty of Members of Parliament have been sent to prison within the last twenty years, but I do not believe that (with deference to your own investigations, Mr. Speaker), a single case has occurred of a sentence of imprisonment being passed upon a Member of this House which was not followed with the least possible interval of time by a report of the circumstances to Mr. Speaker. I therefore want to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he proposes to take any action, and if so what action, to call the attention of those, which I venture to call defaulting Courts, which have made default in regard to the usage of this House. If not, what is to be the understanding for the future? Is a resident magistrate, or other legally constituted Court, to be in a position to withdraw Members of this House from the service of the House without making any report, or drawing the attention of the House to it? For my part, without any hesitation whatever, I wish to say that I support the Amendment now under discussion. The House does not seem to realise, and it is a very mournful thing that it should be so, what is the exact meaning and significance of the present state of the case in Ireland. I am not going into the history of the Crimes Act of 1887, but the House will remember that one of the strongest arguments used by the First Lord of the Treasury in making the Crimes Act perpetual, when we made the objection that the Government would be able under that Act to withdraw the representatives of the sister kingdom from the service of the House without discussion—the argument the right hon. Gentleman used constantly, with the utmost vehemence, but not more vehement than was right, was—and he assured and re-assured the House on that point—that there was no chance whatever of these exceptional powers being brought into operation without the House having full opportunity of discussing the case which was to be made for such a proceeding. Let us consider what would happen in England and Scotland if the Government were to withdraw either of these countries, or the larger portion of them, including the capital of the country, from the operation of the ordinary law. I should like to see it tried in Scotland! And yet, in this House, we are grudged an opportunity, though not absolutely refused, to discuss such an extraordinary and serious step of this importance in the case of Ireland. Personally I for one cannot refrain from supporting hon. Gentlemen below the gangway when they demand an opportunity for discussing proceedings which have withdrawn one eighth of their number from the service of the House.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he was only speaking from report, he was not present when, as he understood, Mr. Speaker read the letter which referred to two of the hon. Gentlemen only who were withdrawn from the service of the House by a sentence of a court of law. He was making inquiries into the circumstances of the other cases, and if the right hon. Gentleman or any hon. Member would put a Question to him either tomorrow or at an early date he would be able to give a full answer to it.

(5.18.) Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said as a Member of the House of many years standing he, like all other Members elected for Irish constituencies, had had frequent occasion to observe the difficulties with which they had to contend in order to do any good for their country in this House, but never before had the incapacity of this assembly to do justice to Ireland been so emphasised. The present circumstances amply illustrated the system by which Ireland was governed. The majority of the Irish Members demanded that the House should give one day in the course of the next two months in order that they might criticise the government of their country, and a more reasonable and moderate demand had never been put forward by any Member of any party in the House. It was characteristic of what he might term the contemptuous insolence with which the Irish people were continuously treated that while this moderate and legitimate demand was being made the man who had been sent by the House and by the Government to conduct the administration of the law in Ireland did not even think it worth his while to be in his seat to hear what Irish Members had to say. Even those who were inclined to hold that the Irish Members were not justified in continually complaining of the treatment meted out to their country, would, he thought, be obliged to admit that under these circumstances there was ground for complaint. If the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland were in his place, he would ask him whether he was prepared to declare that in his opinion Irish Members were not justified in demanding that at least a short time should be given to them for the discussion of the affairs of their country, and he would be much interested to hear the right hon. Gentleman's reply. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman come and support the demand which was made? He could only form the conclusion that it was because the right hon. Gentleman was afraid of the criticisms that would be offered to his mode of administration; criticisms which the right hon. Gentleman knew the Irish Members would direct against him. If he were the Chief Secretary, responsible for the administration of Ireland at the present time, he would welcome criticism and have at least the courage to hear what his opponents had to urge against his conduct. But the right hon. Gentleman was afraid that the opinion of the House would be so stirred by the story of what was being done in Ireland in the name of England, that he refused to allow a single day to be given in order to raise the question before the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose put before the House what must have been in the minds of many when he asked what would happen in England if a state of affairs existed there similar to that which existed in Ireland at the present time; if ten British Members were prosecuted, not under the general laws but under a special law, and sentenced as common criminals and withdrawn from the service of those who elected them, and the Members of this House demanded that a day should be allotted to the treatment of that case. Would it be refused? The public of England would insist on the utmost publicity being given to the treatment of those Members of Parliament. But what happened in Ireland? The representatives of the people were sentenced by an extraordinary tribunal which existed only in that country, and this House was not allowed to listen to the case in which their fellow-Members were involved. The Prime Minister, a few moments previously, had stated in his speech that the case of Ireland had slipped from his memory. How could people complain of the Irish people being discontented and disloyal when they were treated in this way—when they were represented in such a way that so little did Ireland occupy the attention of the right hon. Gentleman that its very existence escaped him? Then, on the motion of the hon. Member for Cork, that this Rule should not apply to days when Irish matters were under discussion, the Prime Minister had said the Irish representatives were not in such hard case, because if they wished to discuss Irish affairs they could easily move the adjournment of the House. This was the first occasion on which he had heard such advice given by a member of the Government, and even if that advice were accepted, the right hon. Gentleman knew only too well that that course would be absolutely inadequate, because moving the adjournment of the House only meant a three hours debate from nine to twelve, which would not give an adequate opportunity of putting the facts before the House. The Irish Members were tonight face to face with a state of affairs to which they were unfortunately too long accustomed. They were allowed to come to this House in order that the world might be told that Ireland was governed constitutionally, and in the House they were denied the right of even having one day—twenty-four hours—to discuss the government of their country. Such treatment would justify the Irish people over and over again in having recourse to every method in their power in order to put an end to a system of government so unfair, so unconstitutional, and so scandalous. It was impossible for him to know from the rulings of Mr. Speaker whether it was in his competence to discuss to any extent whatever the condition of Ireland, under the system of coercion which had been put into force there. The hon. Member for Carnarvon was undoubtedly permitted to discuss in some detail the bearing of the Education Bill, for which the House was told the Autumn Session was inaugurated by the Government, but the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool, upon the other hand, had been several times called to order because he referred, with not nearly so much detail as the hon. Member for Carnarvon in the case of the Education Bill, to the condition of affairs in Ireland. If Members of the House had an opportunity of listening to the statement that could be made as to the operation of the Coercion Act at the present time, it would make those who were opposed to the Irish party as indignant as the Irish party itself. He contended that it was an outrageous misuse of the power of the Government to treat as ordinary criminals well-known Members of this House. The Chief Secretary, who, he observed, was now in his place, would himself admit that Ireland was a crimeless country; there was neither outrage or bloodshed, nor attacks on person or property. There was nothing but a combination of the people—no stronger and quite as legitimate as any labour combination in this country. Yet men who were Members of this House, because they advised the people of Ireland to put their face against outrage, crime, and violence, and place their reliance in this combination, had been sentenced to imprisonment, not as political offenders, but as common criminals, with all the attendant circumstances of degradation and misery which had no equal in this country. One hon. Member of the House, returned by an overwhelming majority, had been sentenced to three months hard labour, and in order that his punishment might be the greater, he was sentenced to three separate terms of one month each, the effect of which was that for the first fortnight of each of those periods he was compelled to sleep on the hard wood bed, was deprived of exercise, and starved upon bread and water. Yet that hon. Member was a gentleman against whose honour not a word could be spoken. He was a man with whom Members of this House were used to associate, and yet he and the Member for East Galway were to be treated like the lowest description of criminals. [Here a remark, which was inaudible in the gallery, was made by a Unionist Member.] He would not pay any attention to the remarks of hon. Members who sneered at the degradation inflicted upon their fellow-Members. He knew that there were Members on the other side of the House who did not approve of such proceedings, and he heartily believed that the majority of the Unionists had no sympathy with the action of cads. He would probably not have an opportunity for some time of speaking in this House, and he was anxious to state how strongly Irish opinion was inflamed by the administration of the law at the present time. He remembered when feeling ran high in this country on the subject of the war, when men were robbed and assaulted, and riotous mobs marched through Scarborough. Then they were told that allowances had to be made for human nature. No allowance had been made for human nature in Ireland, and it was not unnatural that a feeling of indignation should be cherished by the Irish people and their representatives in this House, when they contemplated the punishment, degradation, and misery put upon certain Irish Members, not for any crime, or riot, or disturbance which had been created by them, but because they had advocated, as they were quite entitled to do, a combination of the people and tenants of Ireland in the great struggle which was now taking place between the tenantry and the landlords of that country. Ten hon. Members had been treated in this way, the capital of Ireland had been proclaimed, and newspaper editors and others were being prosecuted all over the country, yet when the representatives of the Irish people asked that one day might be given to them in order that they might justify their proceedings before the world, that time was refused them. He supposed they would be asked next to support the Prime Minister in the division lobbies, but all he could say was that he thought the Irish Party should take the first opportunity to hurl the Government from office. If the Chief Secretary for Ireland imagined that by the course he was pursuing he would break up the combination of the people, and break the spirit, and turn the Irish Members from their course, the right hon. Gentleman was greatly mistaken. There were few among those who sat for Irish constituencies who were not prepared to suffer ten thousand times all the cruelties and all the tyrannies of law that could be put upon them, either by the right hon. Gentleman or any one who might occupy his position. The right hon. Gentleman was upholding a system in Ireland for which over and over again he had expressed his disgust and contempt. Over and over again had the right hon. Gentleman expressed his disgust at the system by which England held Ireland, yet such was his ambition, such his greed of power, that he did not hesitate to fill the position he did in the Government, which enabled him to inflict so much degradation on his colleagues in this House. He invited the House to compare what was being done under the Coercion Act in Ireland with what was being done in England, where outrage and crime of the most dastardly description were punished without half the suffering with which these offences were treated in Ireland. If hon. Members would do that, they would well understand why the Irish people were in a state of semi-revolt at the present time. He devoutly wished and prayed to God that the Irish people had even the remotest chance, with their representatives, of striking with arms in their hands against the violent tyrannies to which they were subjected. If they had but the remotest chance of success they would do it. After all, it was impossible to explain in the British House of Commons the feelings of the Irish people with regard to the treatment meted out to their representatives. But the Prime Minister and the Chief Secretary for Ireland would have reason to know in the future, as they had had reason to know too well in the past, that the Irish representatives were not likely to flinch from the duty entrusted to them. They did not ask that the sentences should be lightened; they did not complain of the paltry imprisonment to which they were subjected; all they asked was that the men who were sentenced in Ireland to these punishments should not be asked to undergo the degradation which was only meted out in this country to the worst class of criminals. Nothing more contemptible, nothing more cowardly or more totally lacking in all the instincts of gentility, could be imagined than the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary in endeavouring to degrade the men who were politically opposed to him. It would be said that these Gentlemen were imprisoned for infraction of the law. It was no such thing. The pretence was too transparent. They were imprisoned because they were political opponents of the Chief Secretary and the Government. If hon. Members compared the administration of the law in the North and South of Ireland they would find that while in the South representative men who openly made speeches were treated as common criminals, in the streets of Belfast blasphemous ruffians were allowed to disturb the public peace and insult the religion of the majority of the people, almost without hindrance. Yet they were told to admire and respect the impartiality with which the law was administered! All he could say was that the refusal of the Government to grant even one day for the discussion of the condition of Ireland proved that the Chief Secretary was fully aware that his doings in that country would not bear exposure and criticism. He therefore hoped that every Member who was not bound to the Government in slavish obedience would support the demand which had been made on behalf of the vast majority of the Irish people.

(5.49.) Mr. LOUGH appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to reconsider his decision. The Irish Party had refrained from moving the adjournment of the House, he believed, out of a desire to promote Government business, and, that being so, it was very astonishing that they should be met as they had been. The right hon. Gentleman was adopting a course which would bestrew his path with difficulties right up to Christmas. The usual practice of the House, when such a state of affairs as was to be seen in Ireland existed, was to grant a reasonable demand for discussion. That was a more convenient way of dealing with the question than by Motions for adjournment, of which, if a day were not granted, there might possibly be half a dozen. During the recess he had visited Ireland, spending the greater part of his time in one of the proclaimed districts. There was not a vestige of crime to justify the proclamation of that area, and a certain incident which it had been thought might lead to crime and was the cause of the proclamation had, as a matter of fact, been peaceably settled. That showed that the House would not be in a position to judge of this question if it confined its attention to the violent aspects of the matter. There was almost a total upheaval of the social system in Ireland. Every class in every part of the country was discontented. Ulster rivalled the West and South in its discontent; the landlords, who used to be the bulwarks of English rule in Ireland, were, if possible, more discontented than the tenants. Under these circumstances it was surely a strong thing for the Prime Minister to say that he would not give the slightest opportunity for discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I never said anything of the kind.

MR. LOUGH had no desire to put words into the mouth of the right hon. Gentleman, but surely he would admit that he had driven Irish Members back on Motions for Adjournment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What I said was that I have followed ordinary precedent in saying that the business of the House at an Autumn Session should be Government business. Unquestionably there must be some safety-valve or some opportunity for discussing other matters, but that is provided for by the Rule of the House in regard to Motions for adjournment on matters of urgent public importance—a privilege which I have never sought to withdraw from the House. In addition to that, there is the more solemn and elaborate method by which, when the Opposition formally demand a day for a vote of censure on the Government, that day is given. This question of the extension of the Crimes Act has already been debated at great length this session

MR. T. M. HEALY said the question that had been debated was that of the application of the Crimes Act without proclamation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think I am right in saying the question was very elaborately debated, although there may have been a certain number of counties added since. Whatever may be said of the action of the Government, I hope it will not be said that it has been discourteous to hon. Members opposite.

MR. LOUGH said he would say nothing more about Motions for Adjournment, except that in the present instance they were most unsuitable and did not at all meet the reasonable demands of Irishmen. The Prime Minister had said a day would be granted if the regular Opposition asked for it. But that raised a very difficult question. The Irish Party were, perhaps, the strongest section of the Opposition to the Government, and, seeing that the demand was supported by so many Members, it would be well not to persist in requiring them to submit to the humiliation of asking an English Member to make this request. As to the point that the proclamation had already been discussed, that was almost a disingenuous answer. The situation was daily getting worse, and the request for an opportunity of discussing it was ruthlessly, almost rudely, refused. He thanked the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose Burghs for supporting the Amendment, and hoped many Members would join him in voting for it in the lobby.

*MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) pointed out that since the House adjourned in August ten Irish Members had been sentenced to terms of imprisonment. He claimed this as an extraordinary state of affairs, and as such they were justified in claiming a day to put their case before the House. If Members were gagged in the House they had no alternative but to go back to Ireland and take to the platform, with the result that they would be put into gaol. Thus, whether they came to the House or went to their constituents, justice was denied to them. Look at the manner in which they were treated in the House of Commons. It had been said that the Irish people would be justified in taking every means in their power to strike a blow back at England if this state of things went on. He welcomed what had been done by the Chief Secretary and the First Lord of the Treasury, and the people of Ireland must be ready to strike back blow for blow. He sat in the House as the representative of one of the divisions of the capital of Ireland, and he protested against the proclaiming of the City of Dublin. He denied that there was any reason for this Act, and he challenged the Chief Secretary to show that there was. After this injustice had been done to them the Prime Minister denied Irish Members even the common justice of being heard in their own defence. That proclamation had done much to convert Conservatives in Ireland to Nationalist principles, and many of them were now prepared to assist the Nationalists in getting a Parliament of their own. He had been told this by many Conservatives, who protested against the wanton insult inflicted upon the Irish people by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. He appealed to both sides of the House to look at what all this meant. They had "removables" to try them and cast them into gaol. If trouble arose in Ireland it would have been created by the Chief Secretary. If the House of Commons refused to hear them that day they would return to the public platforms in Ireland and tell the people that it was no use sending them to the English Parliament where they could not get justice. For whatever might occur in Ireland during the coming winter the responsibility would lie upon the Members on the Treasury Bench. Irish Members knew their duty, and while they had the confidence of the people of Ireland they would carry on this struggle until they achieved their object, and that was the right to manage their own affairs. It was unworthy of a powerful Government to deny to Irish representatives the discussion of such an extraordinary state of things as existed in Ireland at the present moment. The nigger and the painted savage in Uganda got consideration, but the Irish Members only got the plank bed and "skilly." He wished to enter his protest against the action as the Prime Minister, and they would do their best to make things hot for the Government.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) said that after listening to the debate he had been led to ask himself the fundamental question, what did the House of Commons exist for? He objected to the whole Motion before the House, and he wished to ask the Prime Minister to go back to his earlier days in regard to this matter. The right hon. Gentleman made a speech a good many years ago, when he was in a position of greater freedom and less responsibility, in which he said that the House of Commons was not to be judged by its output, or as a machine upon which a Minister could take a handle and throw an important part out of gear, but it was an assembly to consider the wants and wishes and aspirations of the people. He saw a notice in one of the papers to the effect that this Motion would be the first matter before the House, but the width, breadth, and extent of this proposal had hardly been appreciated. The Prime Minister had refrained from quoting any precedent for this Motion, and the precedent of 1893 was not at all connected with the question before the House. Could they fancy such a state of things in the old times? Could they imagine any Leader of the House refusing a day's debate on the state of Ireland in the condition in which that country was at the present moment?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not refused it.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS said they came to the House of Commons to discuss affairs of the greatest importance to their constituents. If anything of this kind was occurring in the counties of England, and if any request of this nature was made by any representative for a county division, such a request would be granted at once. A Motion like this, and, above all, the exclusion of any opportunity to Irish Members to bring their grievances before the House, was a derogation of one of the most sacred duties of this mother of Parliaments.

(6.10.) MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said that earlier in the afternoon Mr. Speaker read two letters announcing that two Members of this House were under arrest, and undergoing hard labour in one of the prisons of Ireland. Mr. Speaker was then reminded that these were not the only cases, and that seven other Irish Members had been arrested, and no notification had been sent to the authorities of this House They all recognised that Irish Members did not stand on a par with other hon. Members of this House, for the authorities in Ireland had given them an example that such was the case. If any English, Scotch, or Welsh Members were arrested, would anybody say that the authorities would not communicate with this House? They happened to be Irish Members, and that was the reason. They had another object lesson in the way the First Lord of the Treasury had treated the Motion made by the hon. Member for the City of Cork. He said that he did not see what ground his hon. friend had for that Motion, and he asked what had occurred in Ireland to justify such a Motion. What did the right hon. Gentleman want to occur in Ireland? Did he want them to go back to the old system of outrage? The Prime Minister himself was in charge of this Coercion Act when it was introduced and passed through the House of Commons, and if any Coercion Act should be reviewed in this House it was the Act of the right hon. Gentleman, which was a perpetual one, and not in the same category as other Coercion Acts. Upon other occasions the Minister in charge proved that exceptional crime existed in the country, but now they had little or no crime in Ireland; and because Ireland was not turbulent, and Irish representatives asked for an opportunity for discussing Irish administration, their request was refused. It was idle for the Prime Minister to say that he had not deprived them of this opportunity. He should like to know what opportunity a Motion for the adjournment of the House gave for discussing matters of that description. In dealing with the way in which coercion was administered they could go into details, but on a Motion for the adjournment of the House that was impossible. The First Lord of the Treasury had in previous sessions given specimens of the way in which he regarded the Irish Members. When they were libelled in the Press and two gentlemen were brought to the bar of the House, his action indicated the amount of respect he had for the representatives of Ireland. The hon. Member ventured to say that the action of the right hon. Gentleman this evening was a new proof that there was one law and rule for the Irish Members and other laws and rules for other Members. Even from the right hon. Gentleman's own point of view the attitude he had taken up this evening would not facilitate matters in that House. Was it not enough that the constitution should be suspended throughout the whole country where crime did not exist? Members returned by that country to state the case in the House of Commons, and to show that coercion was aimed not at crime and criminals in the ordinary sense, but at political opponents and organisations, were refused a hearing. He had never been more amazed than by the action of the Government in this matter. Honourable men were sent to prison to herd with garrotters and pickpockets, because they endeavoured to defend the interests of the people. The mouthpiece of the Government had stated that the Government were unable to settle the land question. That was only another illustration of the incompetence of the British Government to manage Irish affairs in accordance with Irish opinion. He firmly believed that the lesson given to the Irish people tonight would not be lost on them.

MR. BELL (Derby) said he desired to say only a few words in support of the Amendment and against the proposal of the Prime Minister to take the whole time of the House for Government business during the remainder of the session. He did so apart from the fact that he was convinced the state of Ireland was such as to warrant some part of their time being devoted to its consideration. There were many subjects of vital importance to the working classes of this country, which hon. Members had not had an opportunity of raising during the recent session, and which during the present session they ought to have an opportunity of discussing. They had been given to understand that the Education Bill was to occupy the greatest part of the time of the House. The education question, he admitted——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise on the Amendment.

Mr. BELL: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, but could I not extend that to apply not only to the grievances of Ireland but to other grievances also?

*Mr. SPEAKER said that could not be done.

Mr. CONDON (Tipperary, E.) said he would not intervene in the debate were it not that he desired to place before the House certain information which he had acquired as a magistrate, and which strengthened the demand made for a day to discuss the condition of affairs in Ireland. He was well known at home to be an uncompromising foe of British rule in Ireland. He believed the Prime Minister had contributed to no small extent to the promotion of their views in Ireland by his attitude to the Irish representatives this evening, and his refusal to give a day for the discussion of the state of affairs in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that the request would have been conceded if it had been made by a British representative. That was an object lesson which would burn into the hearts of the Irish people. The administration of the Coercion Act in Ireland at present was cowardly and unmanly. The principal reason why he asked a day for the discussion of Irish affairs was that he had personal knowledge of what his friends were enduring day by day in His Majesty's prisons under the Coercion Act. He was Visiting Justice of one of the jails where day after day his friends were subjected to indignities by being compelled, while wearing prison clothes, to pick oakum, to work in wash-houses and stone-yards. The Irish Members wished to have the opportunity of placing before the Members of this House the facts in regard to the alleged offences for which these men had been sent to prison. He believed in his soul that if it could be brought home to the minds of hon. Members that respectable men in Ireland were sent to prison for what were really not offences at all, they would not follow the Prime Minister and the Chief Secretary into the lobby. Never was there an occasion when they had a more absolute right to demand a day for the discussion of the affairs of their country than the present. There were hundreds of Members of this House, on both sides, who knew nothing whatever of the conditions prevailing in Ireland. Ireland was practically on the verge of revolt at present. The Chief Secretary had acknowledged that neither he nor the Government could settle the question in dispute between the landlords' combination and the tenants' combination. There was no crime or outrage in the country. The judges' charges proved that. Criminal statistics, or rather the want of criminal statistics, proved that day by day. Respectable men were being sent to jail because they held opinions contrary to the landlord class in that country. If their request for a day to discuss that state of affairs were not granted now, they would get it yet, whether the Government would or not. They did not ask it as a favour. If the Government refused to grant it, on their heads be the responsibility. The Irish Members were prepared to take theirs.

(6.25.) Mr. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.) rose to continue the debate.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg to move that the Question be now put.

Mr. SPEAKER proceeded to put the Question, "That the Question be now put."

Mr. John O'Donnell remained standing in his place, amid cheers from the Irish Members, and cries of "Gag," "Cowardly," and "Fair Play." The cries of "Order" and the noise throughout the House prevented the words of the hon. Member for South Mayo being heard. He moved nearer the Speaker, and endeavoured to address the House while standing in the second row behind the Front Opposition Bench, but the prevailing noise rendered any report impossible. When the hubbub had partially subsided—

***MR. SPEAKER** said: The hon. Member is not in order in addressing the House, and I hope he will not persist.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL declined to resume his seat, and MR. SPEAKER named him for disregarding the authority of the Chair. Speaking amid considerable tumult, the hon. Member cried, "It is not enough for the Prime Minister and Chief Secretary to put me into jail for six months, but they are now trying to gag me." Mr. O'DONNELL then crossed the floor of the House, and standing near Mr. A. J. Balfour, between the Table and the Treasury Bench, addressed the right hon. Gentleman individually, but the words did not reach the reporters' gallery. When going back to his place, the hon. Member turned round and shouted "I despise you, I despise you."†

MR. SPEAKER at this stage gave an instruction to the Sergeant-at-Arms, to open the doors, which had been closed for the division on the Closure.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR moved that the hon. Member for South Mayo be suspended from the service of the House.

***MR. SPEAKER**: The Question is, that Mr. John O'Donnell be suspended from the service of the House.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): What has became of the Closure Motion?

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): On a point of order, I wish to ask, Mr. Speaker, whether it is in order for you to put that Motion when there is already a division proceeding on another Motion.

***MR. SPEAKER**: Yes. If disorder intervenes, requiring the action of the Chair, it is in the power of the Chair to interrupt the division and order the doors to be opened.

MR. NANNETTI: On another point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to know whether, when we come back from the division lobbies, we will be entitled to take the same position with reference to the action of the Prime Minister, that the hon. Member for South Mayo has taken.

***MR. SPEAKER**: That is not a point of order at all.

(6.28.) Question put, "That Mr. John O'Donnell be suspended from the service of the House."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 341; Noes, 51. Division List, No. 385.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen-Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cawley, Frederick
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Robert Hunter

---

† The Parliamentary representative of the *Freeman's Journal* was "informed" that the words addressed by the hon. Member to Mr. Balfour were as follows:—"Where is that coward Wyndham? When I speak in Ireland he puts me in gaol. When I attempt to speak here you gag me. You are his accomplice in this cowardly business. I despise you both."

Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crombie, John William
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dalziel, James Henry
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dunn, Sir William
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Edwards, Frank
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidst'ne
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gardner, Ernest
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred'rick
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(T'r H'm'ts
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'ds
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. Sir William
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Horniman, Frederick John
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cum. Penr.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cambs
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Morgan, David J. (W'lth'mstow
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A.
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Newnes, Sir George
Nicholson, William Graham
Norman, Henry
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Perks, Robert William
Pickard, Benjamin
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Pirie, Duncan V.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rea, Russell
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (I. of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Smith, H. C. (N'rth'mb. Tyn'side
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)

Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomkinson, James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Wallace, Robert
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Wason, Eugene
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Rt Hn J. Powell-(Birm
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Younger, William
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alex. Acland-Hood, and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ambrose, Robert
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Boland, John
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Grant, Corrie
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Leamy, Edmund
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Govern, T.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shee, James John
Power, Patrick Joseph
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roche, John
Schwann, Charles E.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sullivan, Donal
White, George (Norfolk)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

(6.40.) Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 263; Noes, 148. (Division List, No. 386.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (North Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Chamberlayne, T. (S'hampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Gl'sgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William

FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Phil. S. (Warwick, S W.
Gardner, Ernest
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj. Evans (T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles, Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. D (C'mbs.
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edin., W.)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More Robt. Joseph (Shropshire)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A.
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicolson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pembroke, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Smith, H C. (N'th'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt Hn Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hn, Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barren, Roland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas, (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles

Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, RtHnHerbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Harcourt,Rt.Hon.Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt.Hon.CharlesSeale-
Hayter, Rt.Hon.SirArthur D.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George David
Logan, John William
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Govern, T.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren,Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley,Rt.Hn.John(Montrose
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien,Kendal (Tipp'aryMid)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor,James(Wicklow,W.
O'Connor, J. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly,Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Perks, Robert William
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Redmond, William (Clare)
Reid,SirR.Threshie(Dumfries)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Schwann, Charles E.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas,Abel(Carmarthen, E)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Phillips
Wallace, Robert
Walton,JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner,Thomas Courtenay,T.
Wason Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley,George (York,W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams,Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson,Fred. W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson,Henry J. (York. W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

(6.58.) Question put accordingly, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided:— Ayes, 150; Noes, 262. (Division List, No. 387.)

AYES

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Allan, Sir Wm. (Gateshead)
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thos. (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas.
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,RtHn. HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,David Brynmor(Sw'nsea
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese,Sir Joseph F. (Accringt'n
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwal
M'Govern, T.

M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor, (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Perks, Robert William
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Redmond, William (Clare)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Schwann, Charles E.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Hudd'rsf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Captain Donelan and Mr. William O'Brien.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manc'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt Hon J A (Glasg'w
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S.W
Gardner, Ernest
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn L'rd G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nd'rry
Hanbury, Rt. Hon Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanl'y
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry, Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hon W G Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Col. H L B (Cambs.
M'Calmont, Col. J (Antrim, E.)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A.
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n)
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C. (North'mb Tyn'side
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algeron
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES,
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, "That the Main Question be now put."

(7.13.) Main Question put accordingly.

The House divided:—Ayes, 262; Noes, 145. (Division List, No. 388.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thamptn.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron, (Gl'sgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (M'nc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS. (Warwick,SW
Gardner, Ernest
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon,Maj Evans(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hn. S.F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. GeorgeJoachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Grey, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Sir E.W.(B'rySEdm'ds
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,Rt.Hn LordG.Mid'x
Hamilton,Marq. of (L'nd'derry
Hanbury, Rt.Hn. Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry(Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. ArthurFred.
Jessel,Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. SirJohnH.
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macartney,RtHnW.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, D. (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
M'Calmont,Col.H.L.B.(Cambs
M'Calmont,Col. J.(Antrim,E.)
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinb'gh,W.)
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A.
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray,Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,Herbt.Pike(Darlington)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,Hon.M.W.(Stalyb'dge
Ridley, S. Forde (B'thn'l Gr'n)
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, Wm. Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,AbelH.(Hertford,East)
Smith,H.C.(N'th'mb.Tyneside
Smith, JamesParker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,SirMark J.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col. SirC E H.(Sh'ffi'ld
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt-Col. A C E.(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams,RtHnJPowell-(Birm
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson-Todd,Wm. H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Allan, Sir Wm. (Gateshead)
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston

Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley Frederick
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt. Hn. Herbt.John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir Wm. Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Govern, T.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, N.)
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipp'raryMid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Perks, Robert William
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Redmond, William (Clare)
Reid,SirR.Threshie(Dumfries)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Schwann, Charles E.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R. (N'thants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, David Alf. (Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, Geo. (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson,Fred. W. (Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, HenryJ. (York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(H'dersf'd.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Ordered, That for the remainder of the session, Government business do have precedence at every sitting, and at the conclusion of Government business on each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith), in the Chair.

Clause 8:—

(7.27.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought the Committee ought not to be asked to take up this subject within three minutes of the suspension of the sitting. Moreover, before proceeding to the discussion of Amendments Members were entitled to some general statement from the Government as to their intentions. If the Prime Minister's Manchester speech was an indication of what the right hon. Gentleman thought the Education Bill ought to be, it was clear he ought to put down a series of Amendments to effect the necessary alterations. Then there was the famous Birmingham Amendment, framed with the assistance of the Colonial Secretary; was that to be included in the Bill? Was the spirit of compromise about which so much had been heard to extend to giving not merely the control, but the management, as far as secular education was concerned, to the ratepayers? Before the House adjourned for the holidays the Prime Minister promised to place on the Paper a number of Amendments, including one with regard to rent. That was a matter of great importance, because three-fifths, if not three-fourths, of the so-called voluntary subscriptions were simply rent raised in another form. That and other Amendments had not been placed on the Paper.

It being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

OPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

SOUTH EASTERN AND LONDON, CHATHAM, AND DOVER RAILWAYS BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).

Lords' Amendments to Commons, Amendments considered.

Lords' Amendment to Commons, Amendments, Clause 4B, Section 2, at commencement of section, insert ("Subject to the foregoing provisions of this section") the first Amendment, read a second time.

Motion made, and question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

*(9.0.) MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) opposed the Amendment on the ground that its acceptance would amount to setting the public law at nought by means of a private Bill. He had objected to the Bill before the Recess, because it interfered with the legal rights of parties in a pending action. The case was now much stronger, because on 8th August the Milton Creek Conservators obtained an injunction in the High Court compelling the Railway Company to keep open the bridge for any vessel navigating the Swale, and not having masts capable of being lowered. But the effect of the Lords' Amendments, which were inserted at the instance of the First Lord of the Admiralty, would be to render the injunction nugatory, and to deprive the traders of the district of the existing facilities for navigating the waterway. The Company had closed the bridge without asking leave of anybody: hence the action of the Milton Creek Conservators under their Statutory Powers conferred on them in 1899. Last year the Company promoted a Bill which would have enabled them to erect a fixed bridge, instead of one which could be opened, but the Admiralty and the Conservators successfully opposed that. Then came the Bill of the present year, and it was only when the measure reached the House of Lords in the dog days that the First Lord of the Admiralty, in an empty House and without discussion, introduced a clause which rendered nugatory the recent decision of the High Courts. It was remarkable that though the First Lord of the Admiralty had given notice of such a Clause in the Commons, the Department failed to move it in the House or before the Commons Committee. An opening bridge was necessary in the interests of the trade of the district. Although since 1899 the Companies had alleged that they had no power to deal with this matter except by fresh authority from Parliament, within a very recent period indeed they pretended they had discovered that Section 16 of the Railway Clauses Act gave them power to build a new bridge, and they had deprived the industry of the district of privileges it ought to enjoy by keeping the bridge closed for three years. The action of the Admiralty had not been all that could be desired. The parties interested in safe-guarding the shipping interests had approached the Admiralty with a view of securing its assistance, but instead of obtaining it the authorities decided at the last moment to assist the railway company in setting aside the decision of the High Court. There were important questions of public policy involved in this matter, and he submitted that it was not proper that the legal rights of interested parties—particularly Statutory bodies called into existence to protect the trade of a district—should be taken from them in this manner by a clause in a private Bill.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge) said his hon. friend was hardly justified in saying that the Admiralty were setting aside public law by a private Act, because the injunction which had been obtained in regard to the Swale bridge was founded on a private Act passed in 1861. The Admiralty had no desire or intention to prevent the opening of this bridge for vessels navigating the Swale. But it was the duty of the Admiralty in the first place to protect a much greater interest than that of the trade under the Swale bridge—namely, the national interest of Sheerness Dockyard. That dockyard was on an island, and this bridge was the only means of communication between the dockyard and the mainland. While the bridge had been closed there had been a very large increase of tonnage under it and this traffic, although inconvenienced at present, would probably not have increased very much more had the bridge been open. The Admiralty had nothing to do with the repair of the bridge. Unfortunately the railway company had allowed the bridge to fall into disrepair, and that it might be repaired it was necessary that it should be either open or closed for a certain length of time. Of the two alternatives it was best, in the interests of the dockyard that it should be closed, so that traffic might go over it, especially the traffic of naval ratings to and from the gunnery school and other establishments.

*MR. CLAUDE HAY: Can my hon. friend give me figures as to that?

*MR. PRETYMAN: I do not know if there are any such figures available, but there is constant traffic over the bridge, and it would be most detrimental to naval interests to close it. The interest of the Admiralty in the bridge was recognised to be paramount from its inception by the Act of 1856, to which the Act of 1861 was only a rider. The Act of 1856 gave the Admiralty power to make rules and regulations respecting the opening of the swing bridge.

*MR. CLAUDE HAY: Has the Admiralty ever issued any such regulations?

*MR. PRETYMAN said he had not stated that it had; he had only called attention to the fact that it had power to make regulations as to the opening and closing of the bridge.

*MR. CLAUDE HAY: Were any ever made?

*MR. PRETYMAN said none had been made, but it was clear that the interests of the Admiralty in regard to this bridge had been recognised and power had been given to regulate the working of it, if it were considered that such a step were necessary in the national interest. If the power that the bridge should not be permanently closed, or closed for any length of time against the public interest, were given they could rely upon it that that power would be carefully exercised, and he assured the House that everything would be done not to prevent, but to assist and encourage, the immediate repair of the bridge so that it might be open to traffic under as well as over it. The consent of the Admiralty had already been accorded to the alterations referred to in the statement issued to hon. Members by the Conservators. There was no intention on the part of the Admiralty to exercise any such powers as those which had there been referred to. On behalf of the Admiralty he submitted that the Amendments inserted by the Lords were the minimum necessity in the public interest, and the powers which were thereby sought to be exercised by the Admiralty would cause no injury either to the Conservators or to the interests they represented. He had not received the letter which the hon. Member referred to, and it was hardly necessary for him to say that had he received that letter it would have received an immediate reply. The course taken by the Admiralty was perfectly clear, and in the absence of any further information to the contrary his hon. friend might have safely assumed, and evidently did assume, that the Amendments inserted by the Lords would be persisted in. Careful consideration had been necessary, and it was only that afternoon that a final decision had been come to by the law officers of the Crown. Therefore he asked the House not to agree with his hon. friend's proposal.

(9.35.) MR. TATTON EGERTON (Cheshire, Knutsford) said that as the Chairman of the Committee which considered this Bill he thought it was his duty to inform the House of the reasons why he objected to the Lords' Amendments. The first and second clauses were prepared with very great care, and were submitted to the Admiralty, and they fully protected all the Admiralty interests. At the time of the recommittal of the Bill they had the advantage of the presence of an official of the Admiralty.

*MR. PRETYMAN: Does my hon. friend say that the first and second sub-sections were submitted to the Admiralty?

MR. TATTON EGERTON: Yes.

*MR. PRETYMAN said his hon. friend would remember that the first subsection only was submitted to the Admiralty, and when it went to the Committee the Admiralty did not know that the second sub-section would be added.

MR. TATTON EGERTON agreed that the sub-section for the protection of the Conservancy Board was added, but they were both submitted to the Admiralty before.

*MR. PRETYMAN said the whole of the first sub-section was submitted and agreed to, but the second sub-section was not known to the Admiralty, and was first seen by them after it had been inserted in Committee.

MR. TATTON EGERTON thought the two paragraphs agreed to were quite sufficient for the protection of the Admiralty, and when the witness from the Admiralty was asked if he had any clauses to submit, he replied that he had not, and therefore the Committee considered that they had the option of proposing whatever clauses they chose for the protection of the Admiralty. The Admiralty was not the only party to be protected. Evidence came before the Committee in regard to the previous history of this railway company with reference to this bridge, and that evidence did not give the Committee any confidence as to the action of the company in the future. The railway company got rid of the portion of the Bill referring to the bridge, and there was no obligation upon them either to build a new bridge, or do anything to get a permanently fixed bridge, and what the Committee did was in the interests of the Conservators, who were the only protectors of the traders in that district. There was slipped into the Bill of 1861 a clause by which seventh-eighths of the value of the first Bill as regarded interference with the rights of the public were rendered ineffective. When companies came forward for new powers it was usual that the whole question should be reconsidered, and the Committee had so little confidence that this company would do their duty to the public that they felt bound to put in these particular clauses. By this proposal they made the powers of the Conservators subsidiary to the Admiralty, and they took away the public rights which the Conservators had of protecting the traders. He asked the House seriously to consider these points before agreeing to the Lords' Amendments.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he thought there was some misunderstanding in regard to these private Bills. If none of these Bills had been passed there would have been a public right of way which this Bill would have infringed. The Lords' Amendments, went between the arrangement of the Committee of this House for the protection of the public and the Admiralty. The railway company objected to make a new bridge, and so the Admiralty proposed these Amendments, which were not made before in Committee. These alterations had been brought in without a word of discussion, and the Secretary to the Admiralty was one of the very few people who took any interest in them. Therefore these Amendments were passed and brought down to this House without having been discussed at all. The changes proposed reversed the decision of the Committee that the private rights involved should be protected and the rights of private citizens were to be multiplied by a clause giving the Admiralty full control. In the Bill of 1856 the Admiralty were given an absolute right to make rules, but they never made any, and they allowed the bridge to be closed up, and the public rights were put aside altogether. He thought they ought to stick to the clause inserted by the Committee, and not allow private rights to be overridden by an Amendment inserted at the instigation of the railway company in order to save them the expense of building a new bridge. He trusted the House would not agree to these Amendments, for this appeared to him to be a case of the Admiralty legislating for the country instead of the Houses of Parliament.

SIR W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford) said that as far as the company were concerned, every pledge they had given had been absolutely kept. The hon. Member opposite seemed to have got a little mixed upon this question, for he asserted that the company wanted to avoid making a new bridge. He held in his hand a letter showing that in June last the company sent a special agent over to America in reference to the building of a new bridge, and steps had already been taken for the carrying out of this work. A new bridge would be built over the old one, and its construction would be carried out without obstructing the traffic for more than two days. The Amendments moved by the Admiralty had been intended to secure the traffic to the Sheerness Dockyard. When they heard of this new bridge it was not unnatural that they should wish to secure the traffic, and the companies had no objection to these Amendments if the Government thought they ought to be inserted in order to secure absolutely the traffic during the reconstruction of the bridge. Personally, he thought the House ought to loyally support the Admiralty in this matter.

(9.50.) THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said he desired to say a word or two upon this question, because he was afraid the issue was not quite clearly before the House. Certain disputes had been introduced between the railway company and the Conservators, but with those disputes the Admiralty had absolutely nothing to do. All the Admiralty had to do was to safeguard the public interests committed to their care. The traffic was chiefly barge traffic, but there was a still more important matter, and that was the maintaining without any interruption of communication between the mainland and Sheerness. It was necessary to secure that there should not be any interruption of an important public service for which this bridge was absolutely necessary. For this purpose a clause was inserted providing that the closing of the bridge for the purpose of repairs should be subject to the consent of the Admiralty. That seemed to him to be a very harmless provision. The idea that the Admiralty were going to exercise that power in a vexatious way, so as to interfere with the traffic and the proper navigation of the river, was absolutely chimerical. He was quite sure that those who objected to these Amendments could not seriously entertain any doubt as to the perfect competence of the Admiralty to deal with such matters. The whole question was how were those two interests to be reconciled? As the Bill now stood, it provided that nothing in the section was to interfere with the rights of the Conservators or other persons to free navigation of the river, subject to the provision that the closing of the bridge for the purpose of necessary repairs might take place under the control of the Admiralty. The Chairman of the Committee seemed to think that these Amendments were not properly considered. If there was any want of consideration it was in inserting the second sub-section without fully appreciating its effect upon the first. The hon. Member said that the first sub-section submitted to the Admiralty was adequate for the protection of the public interests. He thought his hon. friend the Chairman of the Committee failed properly, if he might say so with very great deference, to appreciate that point, and all that the Lords had done was what the Chairman of the Committee had intended to do. The Amendment safeguarded the rights of the Conservators. That was the whole matter, and it was an extremely simple one. He thought the ground on which his hon. friend opposed the Amendment was entirely an imaginary one. It would be found that there would not be the slightest difficulty in the matter. He asked the House not to interfere with the Admiralty in a matter which they thought important.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said it appeared to him that the words did interfere with certain vested interests contained in the Acts mentioned.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said they did not destroy the rights, but qualified their exercise so that they should not interfere with the public service.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: It appears to me that the words might be interpreted as relieving the companies.

(9.56.) Question put.

The House divided: Ayes 191; Noes 62. (Division List No. 389.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Bull, William James
Caldwell, James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Saville
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest.
Forster, Henry William
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gardner, Ernest
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Haslam, Sir Alfred, S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick, Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.)
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Law, Andrew Bonar, (Glasgow
Lawson, John Grant
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cum. Penr.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cambs.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Perks, Robert William
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George.
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement, Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles, Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward

Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H(Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.Hon.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A.C.E. (Taunton
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,Charles P. (Glouc.,Stroud
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Edwards, Frank
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fenwick, Charles
Foster,Philip S. (Warwick.S.W.
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gordon,Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Grant, Corrie
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorgeSmyth
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
M'Kenna, Reginald
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary N.)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer,Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Claude Hay and Mr. Mansfield.

Subsequent Lords' Amendments to Commons' Amendments agreed to.

RICHMOND HILL (PRESERVATION OF VIEW) BILL (BY ORDER).

Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

EDGWARE AND HAMPSTEAD RAILWAY BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).

Order for Third Reading read.

MR. BULL (Hammersmith) called attention to the proposal to put two stations on Hampstead Heath. That was something which was not understood before. It seemed to him a very serious thing to pass the Third Reading of the Bill when they knew there were to be two stations on the summit of Hampstead Heath. There was a very good alternative route by which that could be avoided, and he felt bound to protest against the route proposed.

Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

BAKER STREET AND WATERLOO RAILWAY BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).

As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

BROMPTON AND PICCADILLY CIRCUS RAILWAY (NEW LINES, ETC.) BILL.

As amended, considered.

(10.20.) SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham) moved an Amendment to Clause 20, page 17, lines 20 and 21, to leave out "after twelve o'clock noon." This applied to workmen's return tickets, and there was only one other line in London which had this limit to the use of workmen's return tickets for the return journey. He believed the promoters of the Bill were quite prepared to accept the Amendment.

*MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) asid that the object of the Amendment was to enable working men to return home before twelve o'clock in the day, instead of having to wait after that hour. The promoters of the Bill thought that was a reasonable condition, although it did not apply to all the Tube Railways at present authorised. He believed the District Railway had always allowed *bonâ fide* working men to pass the barrier before twelve o'clock; but the Clause was originally inserted to protect the Company against persons who were not working men, such as members of the Bar and other gentlemen travelling with workmen's tickets. As the legislature had not defined a "working man," there was no method of testing in a court of law who was and who was not a "working man;" the promoters were, in the circumstances, perfectly prepared to accept a statutory obligation to do what, as a matter of fact, they had always tried to do whenever they recognised that a *bonâ fide* working man was desirous to travel with his return ticket before noon.

The Amendment was agreed to, and the Bill ordered to be read a third time.

CHARING CROSS, EUSTON AND HAMPSTEAD RAILWAY (CONSOLIDATED) BILL [Lords] (by Order).

As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

NORTH-WEST LONDON RAILWAY BILL [Lords] (by Order).

As Amended, considered; Bill to be read the third time.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee:—

(In the Committee.)

Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the chair.

Clause 8:—

(10.35) **Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE** said he did not think the Committee should proceed with the consideration of this Clause until they really knew what the intentions of the Government were in regard to it. He therefore moved the postponement of the Clause in order to enable the Government to put down their Amendments to it. This was the last Clause on which they would be able to discuss the management of voluntary schools and the relations between the education authority and the managers. It was clear from a recent speech of the Prime Minister that his intentions were not clearly expressed in the Clause. Here they had a long list of the things which the managers were to do and not to do; but that was not the line which the Prime Minister had taken in his speech in Manchester. There he spoke as if the relations between the managers and the Education Committee were to be the same as the relations between the London School Board and their managers—for instance in regard to the appointment of their teachers, which was a most important question. The London School Board appointed their own teachers, although the managers might recommend. Was the final appointment of teachers to vest in the local authorities, as in the case of the London School Board? There was a second question which the Prime Minister had indicated in his Manchester speech. Did the right hon. Gentleman propose that there should be an appeal not merely on the appointment, but on the dismissal, of teachers by the managers, to the local authority? He put it to the Attorney General that at any rate that was not the meaning of the Clause as it stood. Was the right hon. Gentleman prepared now to make clear what his ideas were with regard to the relations between the local education authority and the managers in regard to the appointment and dismissal of teachers, and generally what control the education authority would have over the managers? The words of the Clause were that "The managers of the school shall carry out any direction of the local education authority." What did that mean? Did it mean that the whole of the power was in the local education authority? How far, for instance, did it go in regard to the appointment of pupil teachers, and in regard to the number and the quality of the teachers, and things of that kind? He contended that the Committee ought to get a complete answer from the Prime Minister in regard to these points before the Clause was proceeded with, and therefore he moved that the Clause be postponed.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 8 be postponed."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he was in some difficulty, not that he had really any uncertainty as to the general policy of the Government, but because he had some doubt whether the discussion of these details was in order on a Motion to postpone the Clause. The hon. Gentleman wanted him to make an explanation on various points.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the Amendments to be proposed by the Government were not down on the Paper, and that was his objection to going on with the Clause at present. The Prime Minister asked the Committee to proceed with a Clause which the House of Commons was not to be asked to sanction. The Committee were entitled to ask, before they proceeded to the discussion of the Clause, to have the proposals of the Government in writing.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that if the Amendments to be proposed were fundamentally different from the Clause in the Bill there might be some justification for the argument of the hon Gentleman; but while the Government had indicated their desire to accept Amendments in certain directions those Amendments would be in no sense, if accepted, as he hoped they would be, counter to the general sense of the Clause. The hon. Gentleman had referred to a phrase which fell from him in Manchester a few nights ago, and he seemed to interpret that speech in the sense that he (the Prime Minister) had indicated that in his view the relations between the managers of voluntary schools and the education authority ought to be precisely identical with the relations of the managers of the London School Board to that authority. That was not what he said. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] He thought if hon. Gentlemen would look at any full report of his speech they would find that what he stated was correct. What he did say was that there had been the greatest misconceptions and the most extraordinary misrepresentations on the subject of managerial authority. What he said was that the word "manager" lent itself, no doubt, to misrepresentation, intentional or unintentional, and that he regretted that it had been found to be necessary to use the word. But that necessity had been practically forced upon the Government from a drafting point of view, from the fact that that word was the word used in the original Act of 1870, and if anybody would look at that Act he would see that the word did not carry with it the idea of control. He further pointed to the relations between the London School Board and its managers by way of illustration, and asked, Could there be a greater proof, not in the English language but in Statute language, that the word "manager" did not carry with it the notion of control which had been foisted into these controversies in connection with it? But he never said that the relations between managers of voluntary schools and the local education authority should be identical in all respects with the relations between managers of London Board Schools and the London School Board. What he did say, and what he adhered to, was that, so far as secular education was concerned, it was not the managers who should control the voluntary schools, but the education authority, and he indicated the readiness of the Government—if the House were doubtful that the Bill carried out that policy—to accept words which would make the matter clear. Then the hon. Gentleman had also asked him whether he was prepared to put down an Amendment which would give an appeal to the local education authority in the case of the dismissal of a teacher by the managers on religious grounds. He thought that in such a case there ought not to be an appeal. But if the hon. Gentleman had put to him another question, which was often asked—namely, whether, if a teacher was incompetent adequately to deal with secular education given in the school—if he was not either by his scholastic qualifications, or if for any other reason, competent to deal adequately with secular education—the education authority should require his dismissal — he had not the slightest hesitation in answering it in the affirmative. In his opinion the education authority had under the Bill, and ought to have it, that power.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked what would happen suppose a question arose about the Church Sunday School? He could give many instances of that. Would that be a religious ground?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that that question was hardly relevant to the point at the present stage of the Bill. That question was inopportune; and he was not certain whether he had not been trespassing order in referring even remotely to it. He hoped that after the answer he had given the right hon. Gentleman would allow the Committee to come to the discussion of the Clause itself.

*MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said he did not think the right hon. Gentleman had clearly grasped the point of the hon. Member for Carnarvon. The right hon. Gentleman in his speech at Manchester had dealt with Clause 8 as if it were fundamentally different from the Clause in the Bill, and they asked that the Clause should be postponed until they knew exactly what were the intentions of the Government in regard to it. At Manchester the Prime Minister said:—

> "I think some of the difficulty has arisen owing to a misunderstanding of one of the terms used in the Government Bill, the term 'managers.' I think it is very natural that anybody who saw the term manager in the Bill would say, 'These are the people who have got control of the schools.' It is a mistake, but it is a natural mistake. I don't think it is a mistake for which either the Government draughtsman or the Government are responsible, becaust we have borrowed the term manager from the preceding Act of 1870, and in the Act of 1870 'management' and 'manager' are terms which do not carry with them the idea of control."

But sub-Clause (*a*) stated:—

> "The managers of the school shall carry out any directions of the local education authority as to the secular instruction to be given in the school."

What did the insertion of that sub-clause mean? It meant that if it were not in the Bill the managers need not carry out any directions of the local education authority. Hon. Members opposite might not be familiar with the construction of an Act of Parliament. There was no definition in the Bill of the terms, "managers" and "management," nor any reference whatever to the terms "managers" and "management" in the Act of 1870, and he would show that the terms used in the Act of 1870 could not apply. They had to construe the intention of Parliament from the Bill itself. When an express provision such as he had read, was put into the Bill it implied that, but for the express provision, the managers would not be bound to carry out the directions of the local authority in the way suggested by the right hon. Gentleman. If the local authority had power to call upon the managers to carry out any directions as to secular instruction to be given in the schools, there would be no necessity to insert a special sub-Clause in the Bill. Sub-Clause (*b*) stated that "the accounts of the managers shall be subject to audit by that authority." If the managers were to be mere creatures of the local authority, and were to have no control independent of the local authority, the accounts of the managers would be the accounts of the local authority. But when the accounts of the managers were to be submitted to the audit of the local authority, that implied that the accounts of the managers were not to be the accounts of the local authority. Sub-Clause (*c*) stated "The consent of the local education authority shall be required to the appointment of teachers, but that consent shall not be withheld except on educational grounds." What did that mean? It meant that consent should not be withheld, for instance, on financial grounds. If the managers chose to double the salaries of the teachers, the local authority would have no power to object. There was no provision in the Bill stating what were to be the general powers of the local education authority over the managers. The local authority was to be given the power of refusing assent to the appointment of teachers on one ground, and one ground only. The veriest tyro in the construction of an Act of Parliament knew that the mention of that express condition implied that but for it the local education authority would have no right to refuse assent to the appointment of teachers at all. That brought him to another quotation from the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury at Manchester, which he submitted was an entire, but, of course, an innocent misrepresentation of Clause 8 as it now stood in the Bill. He therefore assumed that there would have to be a new Clause 8, and that was a good ground for asking for the postponement of the present Clause. The First Lord of the Treasury said:—

> "Who raise the rate, who pay the rate? The County Council and the Borough Council raise the rate. The constituency of the Borough Council and the constituency of the County Council pay the rate. Let them manage the schools. Let them have the real control over secular education. If, for example, in a country parish you were to make the real controllers of the school the local managers, if you allow them to draw upon the funds of the County Council, then, indeed, you would violate that constitutional principle; then, indeed, you would divorce representation from taxation; then, indeed, you would be open to some of the criticisms which in my judgment are most unfairly passed upon this Bill."

Now it was surprising, it was almost incredible, but the Bill actually did what the First Lord of the Treasury admitted would give good ground for the criticisms of the Bill by its opponents. The Bill did allow the managers to call upon the local authority for funds. The voluntary schools at the present time were managed by trustees who drew their funds from grants, and any deficiency had to be made up by voluntary subscriptions. It was the trustees who settled the teachers' salaries, who bought the books and the necessary equipment, and who were responsible for all the expenditure in the school. Under the Bill nothing was taken away from the powers of the managers of voluntary schools, but, instead of their having to call upon voluntary subscribers to make up a deficiency, under the Clause all they would have to do would be to send in the Bill to the local education authority and the local education authority would be bound to pay it. That was the Clause as it now stood. [Hon. Members: "No, no"!] He challenged any hon. Member opposite to point to any single provision in the Bill which was capable of a different meaning. In support of what he said he would again refer to sub-Clause (*b*).

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member really seems to be doing what he is asking the Committee not to do, namely to discuss the Clause. The hon. Member is going through the Clause sub-clause by sub-clause, and is discussing it in relation to the other parts of the Bill. The motion before the Committee is that the Clause shall not be discussed. The hon. Member must give some reasons for not discussing it, and these reasons must be so put as not to lead to a discussion of the Clause.

*MR. McKENNA said he thought the argument was perfectly simple. He was showing that the statement of the First Lord of the Treasury as to the intention of the Government referred to something wholly different from the existing Clause 8, and, therefore, he assumed that the Government proposed to introduce Amendments which would make Clause 8 consistent with the statement of the right hon. Gentleman. He argued, therefore, that the discussion of Clause 8 should be postponed until they had on the Paper the Amendments of the right hon. Gentleman which were necessary to carry out his stated purpose at Manchester. He argued further that, as the Clause stood, the local education authority would have no control over expenditure in the voluntary schools, other than by the audit of the accounts, and that the First Lord of the Treasury stated something wholly different from that at Manchester. He therefore suggested that it would be necessary for the right hon. Gentleman to introduce Amendments in order that they might have the Clause in its final form before they began to discuss it. If the managers could not spend money except on the previous authorisation of the local education authority, the accounts of the managers would be the accounts of that authority. The managers would merely be the agents of the local authority. They did not speak of a principal auditing the accounts of his agents. The accounts of the agents were the accounts of the principal. At present the Local Government Board audited the accounts of the School Boards and exactly the same control over the accounts of the voluntary school managers was to be given under the Clause to the local education authority. It was not only the statement of the First Lord of the Treasury that led him to that conclusion. He was also led to it by the statement of the Colonial Secretary at Birmingham. The right hon. Gentleman apparently had no doubt about the construction of the Clause. He admitted that taxation and representation did not go completely together. He said it was a mere matter of degree, and he admitted that there was not complete control over the expenditure. The First Lord of the Treasury said there was, but if that were so why did he at Manchester advise the supporters of the Bill to move Amendments to strengthen the already existing complete control of the local education authority over secular education. The right hon. Gentleman invited Amendments to strengthen control which he declared to be already absolute and complete. The Clause as it now stood gave the managers of voluntary schools exactly the same power that the existing managers of voluntary schools had, subject to such modifications as existed in Clause 8. They would have complete control over the expenditure, with power to send in the bill to the local education authority, who would have to pay it whether they liked it or not, their only control being the control of the audit. Under those circumstances he submitted that the Clause was altogether different from the statement of the right hon. Gentleman at Manchester, and that they were therefore entitled to have before them the Amendments which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to introduce before they proceeded to consider the Clause. Did the First Lord of the Treasury think that the Clause as it now stood gave the local education authority complete financial control? If he did, he was anxious to hear his arguments on that point before he said anything about the misrepresentations of the Bill as it stood.

(11.0.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR made an appeal to the Committee. The hon. Member had made a speech which was more appropriate to the question that the Clause be added to the Bill. If when the Clause had been discussed in Committee, and when the Government had accepted Amendments, it was then found to be inconsistent with anything he had said in public there would be good grounds for the objections now urged. But surely the Committee should begin first of all with the Clause, and see whether it did not carry out in detail the general policy of the Government. If it failed to do this, then they ought to see whether Amendments could not be introduced to make the Clause conform with what had been stated. The arguments advanced by hon. Members were a reason not for postponing the Clause, but for amending it. If the hon. Gentleman would give his intelligent support in the discussion of the Clause, they might be able to bring it into general harmony with the views of hon. Members on both sides of the House.

MR. BRYCE said that the right hon. Gentleman did not appear to appreciate the benevolent intentions with which the Amendment had been moved. His hon. friend's object was to save the time of the Government. His hon. friends understood, possibly erroneously, the right hon. Gentleman at Manchester to mean that he conceived that the Clause ought to give control to the local authority over the local managers, as far as secular education was concerned, so complete that the local managers would be nothing more than the mere agents of the local authority, that they would have no independent *status* at all, and that they would be more or less in the position in which the managers under the School Boards at present were. That was the impression which the right hon. Gentleman conveyed, but when they looked at the Clause they found nothing to carry out that intention. They found, on the contrary, that the Clause assumed a semi-independent authority, because it was necessary to give special powers of audit, to make provision for veto in particular cases, and because there was no provision at all with regard to the dismissal of teachers. Therefore, his hon. friends naturally concluded that the position of the managers was to be a *quasi*-independent position. If that was not the intention of the Government, why should his hon. friends encumber the Notice Paper with a large number of Amendments to carry out what they conceived to be the intention of the Government. Let the right hon. Gentleman put down his own Amendments. If they met the wishes of his hon. friends then they need not put down their Amendments, and the discussion of the Clause would be expedited. He hoped that even now they would elicit from the right hon. Gentleman a declaration as to the substance of the Amendments which he would propose, and in that case he had no doubt his hon. friend would withdraw his Motion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that there was some misconception on this point. He was represented as having at Manchester started a new theory about the Bill. He had sent for the speech which he made in introducing the Bill. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Manchester."] He was appealing against that speech to what he said on the introduction of the Bill. [AN HON. MEMBER: "What does the Bill say?"] He was speaking of the policy of the Government. If the hon. Member thought that the Clause did not carry out that policy let the Committee amend it. He had not shown himself to be hostile to Amendments in conformity with the policy of the Bill. But what was the policy of the Bill? Was it a new policy started in Manchester, or was it the original policy of the Bill? These were the words used by him on the introduction of the Bill:—

> "So much for the authority; now for its powers. We lay it down, in the most absolute terms, that the new education authority is, in the words of the Bill, to control all secular instruction in public elementary schools in its district. Whether those schools are voluntary or whether they are rate-erected, in future, if this Bill becomes law, the local education authority which we create will be absolutely the master of the whole scheme of secular education in every elementary school in its district, voluntary or otherwise."

Those words put an end to all idea of a new interpretation. Let the House now consider the Clause, and, if it did not carry out the policy announced on the introduction of the Bill, and again at Manchester, see if they could not bring it into full conformity with this most explicit statement of policy, which he ventured to say could not be made clearer by any amount of explanation.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said it was not the first time that the Committee had experienced a similar inconvenience in connection with the Bill. They went through the same experience in Clause 7, to which the First Lord of the Treasury put down very substantial Amendments, at a very late hour, which practically changed the whole intention and scope of the Clause. It was then found that they did not carry out the right hon. Gentleman's intention, and they had to be removed and other Amendments substituted. He did not think that the right hon. Gentleman should repeat that action with regard to Clause 8. The right hon. Gentleman had described on various occasions the action of the Bill in respect of managers in a manner which he thought did not agree with the words of Clause 8, and he declared that he was going to make certain proposals. These proposals, however, should be put on the Paper and not left until the last moment, as in the case of Clause 7. The right hon. Gentleman said that there was some misunderstanding about the word "managers." He himself doubted that. It was true that the word was taken from the Act of 1870, but the right hon. Gentleman was probably aware that the word "managers" was always used in the code issued by the Education Department. All the work under the code was given to the managers, and in no case was it given to the School Boards. He thought that there was less misunderstanding about the word "managers" than about the powers and duties of the education authority. The right hon. Gentleman in an attempt to make the words "managers" and "management" clearer referred to the London School Board working through its managers. If the right hon. Gentleman did not mean that Clause 8 should square with the work carried on by the London School Board through its managers, and that the methods adopted by that Board should be also adopted by the managers appointed under Clause 7, he was at a loss to understand why the right hon. Gentleman should have alluded to the London School Board at all. The only possible inference was that the managers would be the creatures of the local education authority, and should be only able to carry out such work as was deputed to them by that authority. But that was not the case at all. What they wanted to know was what were the Amendments which the right hon. Gentleman intended to put down. When the right hon. Gentleman said that the whole object he had in view was to give control to the education authority and not to the managers, he would point out to the right hon. Gentleman that the amount of control to be apportioned between the local authority and the managers almost entirely referred to the appointment and dismissal of teachers. That was a matter on which the right hon. Gentleman had promised Amendments, and they ought to have them on the Paper and avoid the confusion which arose on Clause 7. That was their demand, and he thought it was a very fair and reasonable one.

*MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) said that for months past they had heard that one of the main objections to the Bill, in the view of its opponents, was that it did not give popular control over voluntary schools. Here was a Clause under which the Government claimed, and in his judgment rightly claimed, that that control was given.

The opportunity was open to hon. Members who did not consider that full control was given to put down Amendments making that control clearer, stronger and more emphatic, but, instead of seeking to carry out what they had claimed to be their great desire for months past, there was now a Motion to postpone the consideration of the Clause. He thought that in order to accomplish the object which hon. Members opposite declared to be theirs, and also in order to remove what was evidently the wildest misapprehension as to the interpretation of the Clause itself, they should proceed with its discussion at once. He would remind hon. Members that every penny of money now received out of Government grants by the managers of the voluntary schools would in future be paid to the education authority with perfect freedom to dole it out exactly as they liked. The education authority would receive the whole of the money, and the managers of the schools would be bound to carry out all the instructions of that authority with regard to secular education. There was not a word in the Bill which told the local authority to hand over a single penny to the managers. It was the local authority which would be responsible for the maintenance of the schools, not the managers. There was not a shadow of doubt that if the local authority chose, they might, and no doubt in the great majority of cases they would, as the large School Boards at present did, pay the salaries of the teachers from a central office on the scale adopted by the county. That authority would also, for purposes of economy, equip the schools from one central store, and not allow every set of managers to purchase for themselves. All the money would go into the hands of the central authority, the control would be in the hands of the persons holding the purse; and they would be at liberty to impose whatever directions they pleased Hon. Members opposite objected to the consideration of the Clause on the ground that the speech of the Prime Minister at Manchester was not a correct paraphrase of the Bill. He had read that speech with the greatest care, and, in his judgment, it would have been impossible to have given a more accurate paraphrase of the Clause than was given by the Prime Minister on that occasion. All who had studied the Bill would recognise its absolute accuracy. Surely hon. Members could not now contend that the Government had executed a *volte face* and were about to introduce a fresh scheme? He hoped, therefore, that not merely for the enlightenment of the Committee, but for the removal of misapprehension in the country, they might be allowed to come to a detailed and careful consideration of the Clause, which, from first to last, they had claimed did give popular control over every voluntary school.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he had not the advantage of hearing the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury, but he understood that at Manchester the Prime Minister had used the case of the managers under the London School Board as an illustration of the whole system of management under the Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman had not heard his speech. What he used the illustration of the London School Board for was to show that under the interpretation given to the word "manager" in their statutes manager did not imply control.

DR. MACNAMARA said that he had read the speech delivered by the right hon. Gentleman at Manchester. The managers under the School Board of London were first of all the servants of a directly elected Board of Education for London.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. Gentleman that the question before the Committee is the postponement of the Clause.

DR. MACNAMARA said he desired to correct a serious misapprehension into which the Prime Minister had fallen in regard to the system of management under the School Board for London.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That will arise when we reach the word "managers." It is not relevant to the discussion now before the Committee.

DR. MACNAMARA said he thought it was desirable that the Clause should be postponed until they got the matter cleared up.

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the Clause is postponed it will become impossible to clear it up.

DR. MACNAMARA said he wished to point out that they would find plenty of opportunities for discussing the matter, even if the Clause were postponed altogether. What he wished to point out was that the statement of the First Lord of the Treasury at Manchester was not in accordance with the facts. The system of management under the School Board for London was not the system of management under this Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I never said it was.

DR. MACNAMARA said that the right hon. Gentleman certainly used the London School Board as an illustration after describing the term "managers" in this Bill.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member really ought to have made himself acquainted with what has passed. The quotation he is about to read has been read once, if not twice already, and I do not think that the hon. Gentleman should inflict it again on the Committee.

DR. MACNAMARA said he wished to say on behalf of the London School Board that there was really no connection whatever between the system of management proposed in this Bill and the system of management in the London School Board. Was the First Lord prepared to say that the public authority should have the entire appointment of the teachers as the School Board for London had?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked whether it was in order to discuss a speech he made at Manchester, to put on it an interpretation which he absolutely denied and did not think the words bore, and then to argue upon that as if it were the policy of the Government.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I have pointed out to the hon. Member already once or twice that his speech is really not relevant to the question before the Committee. The only question before the Committee is that the Clause be postponed.

DR. MACNAMARA said he was anxious for the postponement of the Clause in order that the Prime Minister might make himself more fully acquainted with the real system under the London School Board.

SIR W. HART DYKE said he wished to appeal to the Committee to proceed with the Clause. They were touching on the crux of the big question, and the debate turned on whether the local authority was to be the supreme authority on education or not. He had always assumed that under the Bill the local authority would be absolutely supreme in future in regard to all matters of secular education, and for the very substantial reason that they were to be holders of the purse strings. They would hold the money and would distribute it. They would have the power over the schools which the Board of Education at present had, and by which the Board were enabled to withhold grants and to apply a penal remedy where anything was wrong. He assumed that a similar penal remedy would rest in the hands of the local authority in the future, and that where the managers of voluntary schools abused their trust the local authority would be sufficiently supreme and would have sufficient power to refuse grants. Surely, therefore, as practical men they should proceed to deal with the Clause line by line, and endeavour where the Clause was weak as regarded that supremacy to strengthen it.

(11.30.) Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he thought they were entitled after the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who was such an authority on education, to ask the Prime Minister whether he accepted the interpretation which had just been put upon the Clause. If he did, then it was not Clause 8, and that was a good reason for postponing the Clause until they got hold of some words which expressed, as clearly as the right hon. Gentleman had, the intentions of the Government. If, on the other hand, the right hon. Gentleman had not put a proper interpretation on the Clause, that showed that the Clause was not even clear to the supporters of the Government themselves. The right hon. Gentleman either understood the Clause or he did not. If his interpretation were correct, then the Clause ought to be altered. The point before the Committee was that the Clause did not carry out the intentions of the Government as declared by the Prime Minister at Manchester that night, or as declared by the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken, and certainly not as declared by the hon. Member for North-West Ham, who said that the managers were to be reduced to mere dummies. Was that the view the voluntary school managers took of their position? He wondered whether that was the interpretation placed on the Clause by the Archbishop of Canterbury. If it were, he could hardly believe that the Church Congress would have passed a strong resolution in favour of a Bill which reduced the managers to the position of dummies in regard to voluntary schools. [An Hon. Member: As regards secular education.] Secular education was given by the teachers, and if teachers were appointed by a certain body, the members of that body were something more than dummies. The man who appointed the manager of a works was not a dummy in connection with such works. The Prime Minister charged them with misrepresentation.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I never charged the hon. Gentleman with misrepresentation, as far as I know.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he wa glad to hear that. At Manchester th right hon. Gentleman's speech woul lead any ordinary average intelligence like that represented at his meeting, t believe that the position of the manager in regard to the local authority wa exactly the position of managers unde the London School Board. [Hon. Members: No, no.] That was his proposi tion, and he would prove it. At Manchester the Prime Minister said—

> "But the London School Board has the control of its schools. In each of these schools——"

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked if the hon. Gentleman would read what led up to that.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Certainly.

> "It is only necessary to remind you of the case, for example, of the London School Board. The London School Board controls all the rate-supported schools in London, and the rate-supported schools in London contain the majority of the children in London, and, as you know, the metropolitan area is the largest area probably which ever has been, which ever could be, placed under the control of one local education authority. But the London School Board has the control of its schools. In every board school under the London School Board there are managers, but they have not got the control, and the theory of our Bill is that the control should be not with the managers, but with the Borough Council or with the County Council as the case may be, and I would venture to urge upon those friends of the Bill—for in this part of my speech I am dealing with the friends of the Bill—I shall have a word to say about its enemies directly — I would say to the friends of the Bill, that if they desire, as the Government most heartily desire, that public control should be made a reality—and it shall be adequate to the amount of support given out of public funds—I would earnestly ask them to turn their attention, not to the balance of power among the managers for secular education, but to increasing the authority of the Borough Council or County Council as the case may be."

What did those words mean?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that what he was trying to show was that the Government had used the word "managers" in the Bill as it was used in the Act of 1870; the term was used without carrying with it the idea of control. He did not intend to show that they meant that the precise degree of subordination of the managers in the voluntary schools should be that of the managers under the London School Board.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he quite agreed with the interpretation put on the first part, that the right hon. Gentleman wanted to distinguish between management and control. But he quoted the example of the London School Board, and it was obvious what interpretation would be put on the speech by every man of intelligence who listened to it. If any other interpretation was intended, the right hon. Gentleman was quite capable of putting it into clearer and less misleading terms. Did the Prime Minister mean that these managers should be "dummies," as stated by the hon. Member for North West Ham.

* MR. ERNEST GRAY said he had not the faintest recollection of using the word "dummies."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought the substance of the hon. Member's remarks was that the managers would have no real control over the schools.

* MR. ERNEST GRAY: As regards secular instruction.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked whether the hon. Member included in "secular instruction" the appointment of teachers. If not, what did it all mean? The Government ought really to give the Committee some clear idea of what they intended.

MR. MCKENNA asked whether the First Lord of the Treasury accepted the interpretation of Clause 8 as prohibiting school managers from spending money except that provided by endowment or voluntary subscription unless the expenditure were authorised by the local authority.

* MR. ERNEST GRAY: Certainly.

MR. McKENNA: But that was not the view taken at the Church Congress, when the Bishop of Coventry suggested certain modifications of the Bill.

* THE CHAIRMAN said the time to raise that point would be when the Clause was reached. The hon. Member was not entitled to take the cream off all the Amendments.

(11.43.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 78; Noes, 227. (Division List No. 390.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry

Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles

Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter.
Cremer, William Randal

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)

Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred

Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie

Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)

Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.

Kitson, Sir James

Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accr'ngt'n)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas

M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Norman, Henry

Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur

Rea, Russell
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)

Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer, Rt. HnC. R. (N'rthants
Strachey, Sir Edward

Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (M'rthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips

Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Lloyd-George and
Mr. M'Kenna.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.

Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.

Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas

Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W

Gardner, Ernest
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'ml'ts.
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nd)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill

Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn L'rd G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil

Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour

Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)

Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Col H. L. B. (Cambs.
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J. (W'lthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray, C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)

Nicholson, William Graham

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbt. Pike (Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy

Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederick Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (N'rth'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Stroyan, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty

Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col, Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart.
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Committee report Progress; to sit again tomorrow.

LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL [LORDS].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

LONDON ELECTIONS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

POLICE (SUPERANNUATION) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

POLICE EXPENSES BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

MATRIMONIAL CAUSES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL [LORDS].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

HOSPITALS (CONTRIBUTIONS) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

MARINE INSURANCE BILL [LORDS].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

NAVAL PRIZE BILL [LORDS].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

DOGS' REGULATION BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

In pursuance of the Order of the House this day, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 17th October, 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House, at the rising of the House this day, do adjourn until Monday next.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood*).

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

DUMBARTON CORPORATION (FURTHER POWERS) ORDER CONFIRMATION.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Dumbarton Corporation (to be proceeded with under Section 7 of the Act), ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland.

DUMBARTON CORPORATION (FURTHER POWERS) ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Dumbarton," presented, and under 62 and 63 Vict., c. 47, s. 7 (2) ordered to be considered upon Monday next.

WICK BURGH EXTENSION ORDER CONFIRMATION.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Wick Burgh Extension (to be proceeded with under Sections 8 and 9 of the Act), ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland.

WICK BURGH EXTENSION ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Wick Burgh Extension," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 27th October, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for the abolition of restrictions: From Bovey Tracey; Newton Abbot; Stacksteads; Paisley (two); Brixton; Arbroath; Falmouth; Withnell; Chorley; Water; Bacup; Torquay; Cleator Moor; Gravesend; Kilbirnie; Kilwinning; Beith; Enfield (two); Oldham (two); Walton; Wickham Market; Thurso; Eckington; Clown; Whittington; Killamarsh; Stockport; Egremont; Warrington; Edmonton; Horbury; Flockton; Derby; Heckmondwike; Aberdeen; Birstall; Birkenshaw; Doncaster; Londonderry; Trowbridge; Rutherglen; Renfrew; Horwich; Bradford; Little Lever; Chesham; Toxteth; Melton Mowbray; Tiverton; Eccles; Littleborough; Rhodes; Bridge End; Brixham; Eagley; Hull; Radstock; Frome; Stockport; Leven; Guard Bridge; Penge; Sevenoaks; Market Harborough; Glenfield; Cosby; Enderby; Broughton Astley; Liverpool; Shrewsbury; Epping; Greenhead; Churwell; Workington; Maryport (two); Kinning Park; Gloucester; Brandon; Sherburn Hill; Tudhoe Colliery; West Cornforth; Willington; Accrington; Burton Latimer; Raunds; Desborough; Mirfield; Failsworth; Beverley; Leeds; Perth; Hepworth; Droylsden; Mossley; Prestwich; Waterloo; Newtown; Siddal; Keswick; Pegswood; Cramlington; Broomhill; Bamfurlong; Guide Post; Blyth; Harrogate; Ashington; Bishop's Stortford; Bishop Auckland; Shiremoor; Oswaldtwistle; Iron Bridge; Keighley; Oxenhope; Daventry; St. Anthonys; Todmorden; and Denholme; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: From Suffolk (twenty-four); Todmorden; Dean; Bury (two); Evercreech; Low Ham; Henley; Whitehaven; Cowling; Paisley; Stockton; Blairgowrie; Chelmsford; Flitwick; Newark; Ossett; Hull (two); Shepton Mallet; Oakhill, and Belfast; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: From Southport (two); Edmonton; Arbroath; Paisley (two); Egremont; Newton Abbot (two); Withnell; Brixton; Eckington; Clown; Whittington; Killamarsh: Torquay; Gravesend; Kilbirnie; Kilwinning; Beith; Oldham (two); Water; Wickham Market; Walton; Thurso; Falmouth; Stacksteads; Alva; Newtonshaw; Horbury; Flockton; Derby; Heckmondwike; Aberdeen; Bacup; Birstall; Birkenshaw; Doncaster; Londonderry; Enfield; Renfrew; Rutherglen; Warrington; Trowbridge; Bradford; Horwich; Little Lever; Eagley; Chesham; Toxteth; Tiverton; Rhodes; Todmorden (two); Brixham; Eccles; Hull; Radstock; Frome; Leven; Guard Bridge; Penge; Waterloo; West Cornforth; Newtown; Enderby; Market Harborough; Glenfield; Cosby; Broughton Astley; Churwell; Leeds; Liverpool; Greenhead; Epping; Workington (two); Maryport; Glasgow; Gloucester; Burton Latimer; Desborough; Mirfield; Harrogate; Raunds; Beverley; Prestwich; Droylsden; Failsworth; Brandon; Sherburn Hill; Tudhoe Colliery; Willington; Sevenoaks; Hepworth; Bishop's Stortford; Siddal; Keswick; Cramlington; Pegswood; Perth; St. Anthonys; Broomhill; Bedlington; Guide Post; Blyth; Shrewsbury; Bamfurlong; Daventry; Ashington (two); Newark; Bishop Auckland; Shiremoor; Keighley; Oxenhope; Denholme; and Iron Bridge; to lie upon the Table.

EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN BILL.

Petition from Sheffield, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Petition of the Midland Municipal Officers' Association, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PLUMBERS' REGISTRATION BILL.

Two petitions from Leeds, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: From Bacup; Bovey Tracey; Newton Abbot; Water; Whittington; Killamarsh; Falmouth; Withnell; Chorley; Brixton; Eckington; Clown; Torquay; Cleator Moor; Gravesend; Beith; Kilwinning; Kilbirnie; Stockport; Oldham; Paisley; Wickham Market; Walton; Thurso; Stacksteads; Newtonshaw; Alva; Egremont; Flockton; Horbury; Heckwondwike; Aberdeen; Birstall; Derby; Birkenshaw; Doncaster; Londonderry; Enfield; Golcar; Rutherglen; Renfrew; Warrington; Trowbridge; Bradford-on-Avon; Horwich; Little Lever; Eagley; Eccles; Chesham; Toxteth; Melton Mowbray; Tiverton; Littleborough; Rhodes; Todmorden; Brixham; Hull; Radstock; Frome; Churchtown; Leven; Edmonton; Penge; Enfield; Guard Bridge; Prestwich; Accrington; Market Harborough; Cosby; Glenfield; Enderby; Broughton Astley; Churwell; Liverpool; Siddal; Epping; Workington (two); Maryport; Failsworth; Kinning Park; Gloucester; Sevenoaks; Desborough; Mirfield; Burton Latimer; Raunds; Waterloo; Mossley; Droylsden; Beverley; Leeds; Perth; Hepworth; Bishop's Stortford; Keswick; Cramlington; Pegswood; Broomhill; Bedlington; Guide Post; Blyth; Sherburn Hill; Willington; Brandon and Byshottles; West Cornforth; Tudhoe Colliery; Bamfurlong; Daventry; Harrogate; Ashlington (two); Newark; Bishop Auckland; Shiremoor; Newtown; Oswaldtwistle; Shrewsbury; St. Anthony's; Keighley; Oxenhope; Denholme; Greenhead; and, Iron Bridge; to lie upon the Table.

VACCINATION BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Larkhall; and, Middlesborough; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SEA FISHERIES (IRELAND).

Return [presented 16th October] to be printed. [No. 355.]

NAVY (SHIPS' BOILERS).

Return [presented 16th October] to be printed. [No. 356.]

NAVAL TRAINING SHIPS.

Return [presented 16th October] to be printed. [No. 357.]

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Return [presented 16th October] to be printed. [No. 358.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Government Agreements with the Cunard Company and Atlantic Shipping Trust.

(*Question.*) SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether Papers relating to any arrangements made with the Cunard Steamship Company, or any other Shipping Companies or combinations, will be laid before Parliament; and, if so, when.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The Government proposes to lay upon the Table of the House the formal agreements with the Cunard Steamship Company and the Atlantic Shipping Trust when these have been duly executed.

Additional Parish Guardians in Oxfordshire.

(*Question.*) MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received and been able to consider resolutions from Oxford City in favour of additional guardians for the parishes of St. Thomas, St. Ebbe, and St. Aldate on the ground that, though the population and rateable value of these parishes is admitted to be in excess of the population and rateable value of certain other parishes in the union, as St. Mary the Virgin, All Saints, and St. Martin (Carfax), their representation on the Board is not proportionate; and whether he is now prepared either to hold a local inquiry into the matter, or to make a Provisional Order enabling these parishes to proceed to elect additional guardians, and, if so, how many.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) Application has been made to me for an increase in the representation on the Board of Guardians of the parishes of St. Thomas, St. Ebbe and St. Aldate, Oxford, and I have been in communication with the guardians of the Oxford Incorporation on the subject. The guardians at first proposed that the area of the Poor Law Union should be altered, but this proposal has now been abandoned. I have, therefore, requested that I may be furnished with their observations as regards an increase in the number of guardians for the parishes referred to. I drew the attention of the guardians to the matter a few days since, and on hearing from them I hope to be in a position to deal with the proposal that a local inquiry should be held.

Colonial Conference—Papers.

(*Question.*) SIR JOHN COLOMB: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, when Papers relating to the Colonial Conference will be presented to Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) The Papers are in the Press, and it is hoped they will be distributed very shortly.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 294.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee—

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

*(12.15.) THE CHAIRMAN: The First Amendment standing on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for West Denbighshire has already been disposed of by the Committee, for it is covered by words which were inserted in Clause 6.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.), on a point of order, said the words inserted in Clause 6 conferred on the local authority the powers and duties of a School Board, but the Bill also proposed to repeal certain existing powers and duties set forth in Sections 5 to 18 of the Education Act, 1870, and these were the very duties which in future would devolve on the new authority. It was proposed on page 12 of the Bill to repeal Section 5 except sofar as it defined public school accommodation, while Section 18, which was also to be repealed, was that which declared the local authority to be in default if it did not provide accommodation.

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): And if you look at the bottom of page 11 you will see that sub-Section 5 states what provisions shall have effect in lieu of the section. The sub-Section only deals with free places, and it does not deal with the "adequate" amount of accommodation.

*The CHAIRMAN: Section 18 of the Act of 1870 imposes on the School Board the duty of providing adequate school accommodation, and these are the words now proposed to be inserted.

Dr. MACNAMARA: The part of Section 18 which it is proposed to repeal begins "if at any time." If it is repealed there will be no obligation resting on the local authority.

*The CHAIRMAN: But the words proposed to be inserted by the hon. Member for West Denbighshire are practically in the Bill. It is not proposed to repeal that part of Section 18 which lays on the School Board the duty of maintaining such additional school accommodation as may be necessary.

Dr. MACNAMARA: The latter part of Section 18 of the Act of 1870, which provides that the local authority shall be declared to be in default if it does not provide the accommodation, is proposed to be repealed.

Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): Section 18 leaves it to the discretion of the School Board to say whether or not it shall provide additional accommodation, but Section 5, which this Bill proposes to repeal, imposes an absolute statutory obligation upon the School Board to supply accommodation whenever necessary.

*The CHAIRMAN: I see no reason whatever to alter my opinion that the words now proposed to be inserted are already in the Bill. We cannot go on inserting the same thing over and over again. The matter is now disposed of.

Mr. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) moved, as an Amendment to the first section of the Clause, providing that the local education authority shall maintain and keep efficient all public elementary schools within their area which are necessary, to substitute "may" for "shall." There would, he said, have been no necessity for this Amendment had Clause 7 retained its original form, but, in view of the proportions decided on for the managing body, he felt it necessary to propose an Amendment which would enable the county authority to make choice of the schools of whose maintenance and efficiency it should think fit to undertake the entire responsibility. He thought the First Lord would find it very important to consider some such proposal as this in view of the attitude taken up by many local authorities. He might instance the County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire, which had now come to the conclusion that it would be impossible to perform all the duties which the Bill would lay upon them. What was the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (whom he wished to congratulate on his promotion to office), going to do in face of that attitude? He was not to be envied if it was to be his duty to compel Councils to undertake work which would be extremely distasteful to them. Surely he could not by *mandamus* compel a County Council to carry out a policy, and this Amendment sought to obviate the friction which was bound to arise.

Amendment proposed,

"In page 3, line 4, to leave out the word 'shall,' and insert the word 'may.'—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the Clause."

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): May I ask if this Amendment is in order? I listened with attention to the arguments of the hon. Gentleman, and as far as I could gather his meaning he desires to revive Clause 5, which was dropped out of the Bill. Clause 5 left it optional to the authorities to administer the Bill, and that, I take it, is the object of the present Amendment.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON: My proposal is exactly the reverse of Clause 5. If this suggestion were adopted, town councils would naturally take over the public schools of which they had control, but would decline to give public money to the schools which they did not take over.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Well, I do not press the point. If the hon. Gentleman aims at a differential treatment between different schools in the same area by the authorities over that area, that, I think, is an impossible solution of the difficulty. The Government were alive to the difficulty, and it was in order to meet it that Clause 5 was introduced; but it is absolutely certain that the method proposed by the hon. Gentleman would be an intolerable way of meeting it. If the whole elementary scheme of secular education in the country is placed under the control of a popularly elected body, and the hon. Gentleman's Amendment were carried, the result in the West Riding, as I understand him, would be that while the County Council would be quite ready to take over all the School Boards, they would leave the education in the voluntary schools in the position in which it is at present—that is to say, in many cases, in an unsatisfactory position. I do not think the Government can be asked to accept that, and if the hon. Gentleman's suggestion were carried out at all it could only be, I think, by a revival of Clause 5.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): The objection of my hon. friend is in reference to the difficulty felt by County Councils, and other bodies who are to carry out this Bill, when called upon to administer finances of which they have not control.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: They have control.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: That is the very point on which we want an understanding. We have now come to the Clause which deals with control, and we want an explanation from the Government as to what is the nature of that control. It has been stated over and over again that there is absolute control of all secular education; for that purpose there are six managers, and the authority which is to administer, and to spend the money, out of those six has one voice. The management you have here is a totally different thing from that in the board schools in London and other large places. But what is the method? We are told it is not to be the old method. But the great defect of this Bill and this Clause is that there is no definition of the attributions of the various managers. In order to make the Bill intelligible and to prevent friction there ought to be a clear definition of what are the duties and powers of these several managers. I want to know is this one representative, among six, to have complete control of secular education? If so, what are to be the functions of the other five? Secular education, I understand, is to be the main part of elementary education, yet it has been thought necessary for the purpose of safeguarding dogmatic teaching that you should have four, as against the one man who is to have charge of the secular teaching. I want to know what those four private individuals are to have the power to do in the schools, and whether they will have a voice in anything else besides the clerical dogmatic teaching. If it is the case, let it be clearly understood that there is one man only among the managers who has a word to say in the conduct of the schools during the whole of the school time except that set apart for denominational teaching, and let us know where we are. That has not been explained, and I think it ought to be explained. The representative of the popularly elected body is after all human; he may sometimes be absent, but some of the four will be present, and in that situation who is going to direct the schoolmaster in matters which arise every day in the ordinary secular work of the school? Are they or are they not to control and direct the schoolmaster in any part of the ordinary, regular, daily business of the school? That lies at the bottom of the whole question. The right hon. Gentleman in his speech at Manchester said that too much importance had been given to the word "management." Then let us understand how much importance belongs to the managers, and to the managers of each separate class. We have been told, I think, by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich that what he wanted was a Church atmosphere.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): No; I never said that. I do not think I said that.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Well, I do not know who has the credit of the word "atmosphere," but, if the noble Lord disavows it, I will treat it as an anonymous statement which has been accredited certainly by the ecclesiastical party. They want an atmosphere.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must remind the right hon. Gentleman that the only question now before the Committee is the proposed option of the local authority to support some schools and not others. I do not see how the matter he is now discussing is relevant to that.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The whole question of whether there is any objection to the inclusion of all the schools depends upon this vital question of management, and it seems to me that that lies at the root of the whole thing—whether or not the education authority, that is to say, the County Council, has entire control. I think the right hon. Gentleman the other day said that the word "management" which had been introduced into the Bill had tended to obscurity. That is perfectly true.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think I said that it gave opportunities for misrepresentation. I do not think I said it was obscure.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Well, that it led to misrepresentation. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will excuse me for disavowing the misrepresentation, and allow me to say "want of comprehension of the meaning of the Bill." That is what I am pressing on the right hon. Gentleman. I venture to say that the whole thing turns on this question of management. No doubt you may have managers who are immediately under the control of the School Board—say, of London, or of any large town—but that is not the case in the rural districts. One great objection and difficulty that we have in this Bill is the postponement of Clause 12. That Clause, in my opinion, ought to have come at the beginning of the Bill, because it deals with the constitution of the education authority. Until we have some idea of what that authority is, how are we to understand what are the functions of the managers? It is quite plain that the education authority, which is a Committee of the County Council——

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, Order! I really do not see how that arises under this Amendment, nor does the matter which the right hon. Gentleman was discussing arise, because, supposing this Amendment were to be accepted and passed, that would not affect the proportion of the managers. The proportion of the managers would remain exactly the same whether this Amendment were passed or not.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I beg your pardon. I have not been referring to the proportion of managers, except incidentally. I want to know what the functions of the managers are, and that is dealt with in this Clause.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but not in this Amendment.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: This Amendment is founded upon the objection that because the County Council have not complete management they ought to have the option of supporting the school or not. I come to this point, that the question of this management, and the amount of it, is the keystone of the whole debate. We have the assertion of the Government that there is to be complete control of secular education. Unless we have some elucidation of that we cannot get on with this Bill, because the intentions of the Government have not been explained. Therefore I do ask, what is the amount of control which this single representative of the County Council on the management is to have, and what is to be the power of the other managers? Is this one man to have the sole and absolute control of the school at all times, and in all matters which do not affect denominational teaching? That is a very clear question, and I think we ought to have an answer. I venture to say that in rural districts this one man is the only means of direct communication between the education authority and the managers of the school. It is impossible that the committee who are to form the education authority in a large area can be present in person, or that any of their number could be present in person, as a regular matter, in these rural schools. Tell us what will be the functions of these managers. In my own county the education authority will be at Winchester. The only means of communicating with regard to the conduct of the school must be through the one manager, and what we want to have from the Government is a statement whether or not that one manager will be absolutely master of the whole of the schools except in regard to denominational teaching. Tell us what will be the functions of the other managers?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I really must appeal to the right hon. Gentleman. I do not think he is treating me fairly. I have told him two or three times that this matter does not arise on this Amendment. It is a matter which must arise upon a subsequent Amendment, and I would really appeal to him to treat me fairly in the matter. It is extremely difficult for me to keep the Committee to the point, and a right hon. Gentleman of such long standing as the right hon. Member I should have thought would assist the Chair.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Well, I hope that I have not deserved that rebuke. [AN HON. MEMBER: You have.] I have endeavoured to ask from the Government an explanation which I believe will clear up a great many difficulties which exist, and I believe that a short and plain statement of that kind would have facilitated business. As to treating the right hon. Gentleman fairly, there is no man in this House, I hope, who more desires to treat the Chair fairly, and to treat the right hon. Gentleman with that respect which I sincerely feel for him. I thought that at the beginning of a Clause which deals with the whole question of management, and upon which all the Amendments must depend, a request for an elucidation from the Government would forward business, and not retard it. I believe so still, but if it is the fact that we are not at liberty to ask for an explanation from the Government of their views upon this subject, I bow at once to your decision. I regret that it is necessary to take a course which, in my opinion, will add to the difficulties of the discussion, and which will prolong and not shorten debate.

*(12.50.) SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he had been anxious on several occasions in the course of those debates to make one or two comments on the action of the West Riding County Council. He had considerable interests in that part of the country, and spent a certain portion of each year there, and he could not help expressing his sincere disappointment at the policy the Council had adopted with regard to the Education Bill. He was sure that the West Riding County Council would be perfectly adequate for the task which this House sought to impose on them. The County Councils in Lancashire and Yorkshire were doing a magnificent work in the cause of technical education, and the many schools over which they exercised supervision proved—

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I do not see what relevance this has to the Amendment. Will the hon. Gentleman kindly apply himself to the Amendment before the Committee?

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said that, of course, if he had trangressed he was extremely sorry. He was simply controverting the argument that the West Riding County Council were not adequate to perform the duty put upon them, and therefore that the word "may" should be inserted instead of "shall." That was a proposed change of a fundamental character. The object of this Bill was to create the same authority all over the country, and if "may" were substituted for "shall" the Committee would be going back upon important decisions which it had already given. In substance the Committee had already decided that there should be a universal decision.

MR. M'KENNA said that, as it now stood, the Bill imposed an imperative responsibility upon the local authority for the maintenance and efficiency of the elementary education. His hon. friend proposed that the responsibility should be optional and not imperative, and he supported him in that because, under the Bill, it would be in the power of managers to incur liabilities which the local authority would be bound to pay. If the managers failed to carry out any directions of the local authority they were under no penalty. It was not reasonable that the responsibility for efficiency should rest with that authority when it had no means of enforcing obedience to its instructions upon the managers. Of course, they could undertake the responsibility for maintenance, because the public purse was practically unlimited, but he did not see how they could be held responsible for the efficiency of the schools. He was accordingly in favour of making the responsibility of the local authority optional, seeing that they were asking the local authority to carry out a duty which the Act gave them no power to enforce.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) opposed the Amendment. He said it might be necessary to insert words which would make the control thoroughly efficient and effective, but if this Amendment were carried it would revive option in a much more objectionable form than it originally appeared in the Bill—a form which was condemned by a very large majority. The result would be that any county or borough authority would have the power to decline to have anything to do with elementary education. Under the Clause already passed, the powers and duties of the School Boards and School Attendance Committee had been transferred to the local authority, which was to have complete control over secular education, but if the Amendment were carried it would not be bound to give a single penny towards the support, say, of a voluntary school. It would give bodies which held opinions represented by hon. Gentlemen opposite the power to starve out voluntary schools, and would render our educational system far more chaotic than at present. It was a most unsatisfactory Amendment.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said it might be an unsatisfactory Amendment, but then they were dealing with a very unsatisfactory state of affairs. The whole situation had entirely changed since the House adjourned in August last.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: How?

MR. TREVELYAN, continuing, said there had been an agitation in the country. The least formidable part of that agitation was the speeches made by Members of this House. Rather more formidable had been the expressed intention of Nonconformists to refuse to pay rates, but the most serious part of the agitation was the declaration of some county councils that they would find themselves incapable of administering the Bill if it became law. Three Welsh counties had announced that they could not undertake the responsibility of administering the Bill, and the great County Council of the West Riding had passed a resolution declaring their opinion that if the Bill became law in its existing form any attempt of the council satisfactorily to administer its provisions would be futile and hopeless. The fact that this county council was composed of responsible businesslike men made that a very serious consideration indeed. It was probably the most important County Council in the North of England, and surely its declaration that it regarded it as futile and hopeless to work the Bill had created a new situation. In many towns the municipal elections in November would be fought on the education question. Test questions were being put to candidates as to whether they would refuse subsidies to schools in which religious tests for teachers were still retained, and no doubt the result of the contests would be the election of many municipal authorities pledged to protest against the working of the Bill. That would necessarily lead to friction between the local and the central authority of a very serious kind, and therefore he believed the Government would do well to accord to the local authorities a latitude of action which would prevent them from coming into collision with the central authority.

DR. MACNAMARA asked what would happen if the local authorities had the right to please themselves whether they would assist voluntary schools or not? Take the case of the great towns in which they had such admirable School Boards. People would no doubt be very sore over the abolition of these Boards. What would they do? They would say: "We will give no aid to the voluntary schools." But they must not forget that the voluntary schools educated half the working classes of the country, and these children were the citizens of tomorrow, just as much as the board school children. They were told that the premises of these schools were old, that the teachers were ill-qualified, that the teaching apparatus was antiquated and scanty, and that, in every respect, they failed to meet modern requirements. Yet his hon. friend contemplated that state of affairs with satisfaction, and would support a continuance of that state of things! He disagreed with the policy of wiping the slate clean. Take the other case. There were eight great county boroughs which never had a School Board—county boroughs like Stockport, Wigan, and Preston——

*Sir FRANCIS POWELL: We have a School Board in Wigan.

Dr. MACNAMARA admitted that he had not quite accurately stated the fact. They had a School Board in Wigan which levied a small rate, but it had no board school. With regard to those great towns that had no rate, it had been said of the people that they preferred denominational teaching; that, no doubt, was quite true. The great bulk of the people of those towns would assent to any sort of religious instruction rather than pay a rate. If they had this option they would say "Things will go on very well; we have never had a rate here, and with God's help we never will." He had spoken of the hopeless condition of Stockport with regard to their schools, and their preference for the denominational system. The one good thing about this Bill was that it would make the authority come down on the ratepayers. If they came down on the ratepayers it would be a good thing, as it would make these people meet their communal obligations, which they had so long been able to contract themselves out of under the guise of piety, which was only another name for parsimony. There was a meeting at Stockport to disagree with everything he said, and the meeting was told not to be frightened about the prospect of a rate, that there would be no rate, and that there was another million additional State-aid, so that they would be able to keep Stockport free from rate. And that sort of thing would continue. These eight great county boroughs, containing over 100 municipal areas—a third of the municipal areas of the country—would continue to contract themselves out. What had to be done was to make education a public charge at once and universally. Grateful as the country was to the voluntary contributor, it could not be doubted that the time had gone by when he could be of use. Yet this state of things was going to be continued by the use of the word "may" instead of the word "shall." So far as he was concerned, he was prepared to let the Bill go with all its faults, because he was convinced that those local authorities which now protested against it would see in double-quick time that if popular control were assented to, it would be complete and full. If they left the matter to the local authorities, the genius of the English people would see to it that this public money would be followed by popular control.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he did not doubt the genius of the English people, but it operated very slowly and took a long time to come into operation. This sort of talk went on in 1870, and the only result since then had been that whilst the voluntary contributions had gone up to something like £5,000,000, control had not been increased at all. Every one was agreed about the inefficiency of the voluntary schools, but what was the influence which kept them from being condemned in all these years while they were receiving the Government grants, when as a matter of fact they ought to have been condemned? It was a curious fact that the people who had succeeded in evading the law all these years were the very people who condemned the breach of the law when it came to a question of religion. The best way of meeting this state of things was not by making the Act compulsory. If they made the proposal compulsory, they lowered and degraded the standard of education, but if they made it optional they would force up the standard all over the country. He instanced the County Council of Glamorganshire, who could not administer the Act because there would be such a feeling that they could not get a sympathetic authority, and they certainly would not go against the wishes of their constituents. Would there be a *mandamus* to compel the council? Did that mean that they would send some one to gaol for contempt of Court? Whom would they send? Would they send the Chairman of the Glamorgan County Council to gaol? They had provided for that already by electing a Conservative, and the Government could not imprison its friends. But they might say, "Well, there was the clerk," but he was a good old Tory. Would it be the county treasurer? He was the leader of the Conservative party in the county. Although it was a liberal and progressive council, it happened that all their officials were Conservative. That only showed how broad-minded they were. And these were the County Councils to which they would not give an option! It was amusing to see London Members, who had not room for one-fifth of their people in their chapels, so concerned about religion that they would not allow this matter to be left in the hands of the County Councils of Wales. He did not think the Prime Minister had gone so far as the late Chancellor of the Exchequer in contemplating the possibility of this civil war. They would have to face it throughout the whole country. The Prime Minister might think there was nothing in it, but he would know better after the November elections. It was a question of dealing not with a small Welsh County Council, but with Town Councils and County Councils all over the country. If the Prime Minister was going to put the 250,000 inhabitants of Fulham into prison he would require a new Prisons Bill as a sequel to the Education Bill. It was far better to trust these Councils. They had a great sense of duty and responsibility, and would act in moderation and even in a spirit of compromise. The Church laity, being anxious to see their schools preserved, would meet the County Councils in a spirit of conciliation, and a good working arrangement might be arrived at. If the Prime Minister desired to see his Bill a success it would be better to leave this option. The extreme Nonconformists were the party of lavish expenditure on education, and the Church party was the party of economy. Unless this option was given, the party of lavish expenditure would be arrayed with the party of parsimony, and education, not merely in the voluntary schools, but as a whole, would be starved out. The Prime Minister had a chance once more of, at any rate, giving his Bill a chance. By leaving it to the County Councils and Town Councils to make the best arrangement they could, there might be something which would be workable.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought that anybody who had listened to the hon. Gentleman would be of opinion that he was justified, at an earlier stage of the proceedings, in reminding the Committee that the difficulty which had been raised was really the difficulty which Clause 5 was intended to meet. Clause 5 was the proper remedy. He thought the hon. Member desired this particular form of option, as distinguished from that of Clause 5, because it would give the County Councils an opportunity of squeezing the voluntary schools out of existence.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the voluntary schools could not be squeezed out of existence, because they had the buildings and they could always say they would take the buildings away. On the other hand, the council could give or withhold the rates. At all events, they could meet as equal partners; each party would have something to give away, and that was all that was wanted to make a bargain.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it seemed to him that the only thing the hon. Gentleman's friends would have to give away was, he would not say their consciences, but that to which they had a conscientious objection. They went about saying with great earnestness and, he was sure, with perfect conviction, that it was a wicked thing to contribute to the support of any school in which denominational teaching was carried on.

MR. M'KENNA: They do not say that.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said, that without going into the comparative merits or demerits of the great County Councils, he did not think it would be wise to have the parti-coloured system of support which the Amendment would introduce into the Bill. The County Councils would themselves be constantly fighting as to whether they should support this or that denominational school, and as to the amount of the support to be given. That was not a practical or a tolerable system. Clause 5 left it open to the Councils to say whether they would work the Bill or whether they would not. But, if they worked the Bill, let them work it as a scheme in its entirety, dealing with all schools in their area upon one principle, and for the common good of the children in the county. He hoped it was not in this direction, at all events, that the Committee could be induced to listen to any change desired by the hon. Gentleman.

*MR. ABEL THOMAS (Carmarthenshire, E.) said the Carmarthenshire County Council had come to the resolution that if this Bill were passed they would not carry it out, because they could not, and because they had conscientious objections. Only two out of forty Members voted against that resolution, and even they, although Conservatives, did not speak in favour of the Bill, but simply said that as county councillors they ought not to pass such a resolution. Such resolutions were passed with the intention of being carried out. Thus, since the House adjourned in August a new position had arisen which they had to face, and he should vote for the Amendment because it was a way out of the difficulty.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said that after the discussion of the previous evening the only foundation for the idea that there could be control of any completeness in the hands of the local authority over the local managers lay in the word used by the hon. Member for North West Ham with regard to the "power of the purse." But, if in the very forefront of the Clause it was laid down that the local authority must maintain and keep efficient the schools, the power of withholding supplies was withdrawn, and the whole argument of the hon. Member for North West Ham was knocked on the head. "Shall" meant "must," and "must" meant a statutory obligation to maintain the schools efficiently. Cases had been cited in the House in which managers had evaded the Conscience Clause by taking children from the schools to a service called the "Mass," not in the hours allocated to religious instruction but in the ordinary set hours, and the late Vice President of the Committee on Education had repeatedly stated that he had no power to interfere. Suppose in such an instance a County Council threatened to withhold the supplies from the school until the objectionable practice was discontinued, they would not have a leg to stand on, because by the word "shall" they would be bound to continue the salaries of the teachers and to maintain and keep efficient that school. That was a conclusive reason in favour of the Amendment. He thought the Committee would be well advised not to let the difference between the word "shall" and "may" pass until they had got some much better assurance of real control over the acts of which they had ample evidence on the part of managers, and which this Bill gave no more power to control than they had at the present time. That was a consideration which had not yet been put before the Committee.

(1.30.) MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said that before they went to a division he should like to say one word in reply to what the right hon. Gentleman had said. The importance of the Amendment was that it brought them face to face with a serious practical problem which was threatening them. This was not the time to force upon local authorities functions which they disclaimed, and which they declared they were unable to undertake. The right hon. Gentleman must face the fact that a number of these Boards said they could not do the work. How were they going to meet that difficulty? The right hon. Gentleman had given them no light upon that point. These Boards said they had not the machinery, or the connection with these denominational schools, which would enable them to exercise effective control over them. The right hon. Gentleman had not thrown any light upon the question as to how the county and borough councils were to act in regard to these schools. If they gave an option to the local authorities they would be able to make terms with the sectarian schools. This proposal would afford material for a bargain which would be better than the conflict to which the Bill was leading. On those grounds he felt that he must support the Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman said the House should give County and Borough Councils power to deal with all the schools in one area upon one principle, but that was exactly what the Bill did not do, and so far from doing this it created two sets of schools, one set over which they would have complete control, and the other over which they would have a smaller and qualified control. It was because they had not this power that they were obliged to make this protest.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) said the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs stated that whenever this power had to be enforced it would be by mandamus, and would be addressed to the officials of the County Council. He thought his hon. friend was wrong there. The course would be to get a resolution proposed before the council to enforce some part of these powers, and then those who refused to carry out that power would be mandamused by the central authority as having refused to carry out the resolution. He did not think it was fair, that in carrying out this Act, only one section of the community should be liable to go to prison. A very large number of people had said that, rather than pay the education rate, they were prepared to go to prison. Men like Dr. Clifford meant what they said upon this question. What would happen when the Government came into conflict with the local authority? They were calling upon men who had offered their services to the constituencies for particular purposes to do an entirely different class of work for which they had not offered themselves, and of which they had no knowledge when elected. When the Opposition suggested that this Bill should not be brought into force until after a County Council election, the Prime Minister refused that Amendment, and insisted upon imposing these duties upon the men already elected. In the case of the Keighley Board of Guardians, they refused to carry out a particular provision of the Vaccination Act, and the Local Government Board mandamused them and the Guardians went to prison. He had looked up the records to find how they got out of prison, but he was not successful. From the information he had received from one of the guardians, the Governor of the gaol came to him one morning and said, "Well, you can go home." The guardian replied: "I do not want to go home, for I am not going to obey the orders of the Local Government Board." The Governor said that he had nothing to do with that question, and said he had been told that he could go home, and this guardian went home. Therefore, when these guardians had been in prison a few weeks the Government opened the prison doors and let them go home. Whenever the Government attempted to impose duties upon local authorities which they did not want to carry out the same thing would happen.

*MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said that Members on their side of the House fought to establish the right of popular control over secular instruction in the schools throughout the country. The Prime Minister would relieve the country of great uncertainty and Parliament of a very serious waste of time if he would put before the House the exact measure of popular control to be given by the Bill. He appealed to the Government to relieve them of the necessity of fighting one Amendment after another to secure it.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not confining himself to the Amendment, and he is discussing a subsequent Amendment. There is an Amendment on the Paper which raises this very point, and therefore the hon. Member must confine himself to the Amendment before the Committee.

*MR. HELME said that he should like to be assured that the control to be given to the local authorities would be effective, and he should have preferred to see the direction to them made absolute. In present circumstances he was bound to vote for the Amendment, as seeking to secure for the authority the power of making what arrangements seemed to them to be best.

Sir WILLIAM MATHER (Lancashire, Rossendale) asked the Chairman on what Amendment this very important question might be raised. It was the crux of the Bill.

*The CHAIRMAN: There are several. There is one standing in the name of one of the hon. Members for Monmouthshire. There are also many others.

Sir JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington) asked if that was not limited to the control of the expenditure.

*The CHAIRMAN: This is not a question for me to answer. All I have to decide is whether the discussion is relevant to the Amendment now before the Committee.

Mr. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) said he wished to deal with this question entirely from the point of view of administration and education. He felt confident, at all events, that in Wales, if the County Councils were allowed to have power to negotiate with the managers of voluntary schools, there would be little or no difficulty, and in a very short time terms which, would be satisfactory to those who wished to see complete popular control, and also to those who desired to retain control over denominational schools, could be arranged so as to secure the cordial co-operation of those bodies. He was confident that if negotiations between the County Councils and the managers of voluntary schools were allowed, within a very short time they would come to such an arrangement as he had suggested. The idea that Christianity in Wales was in any jeopardy was absurd.

(1.43.) Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 198; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 391.) (2.0.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHnGerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Campbell, RtHn J. A. (Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHnJ. A(W'rc'r
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlts
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Law, Andrew Bonar, (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William

Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Manners, Lord Cecil
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants)
Mooney, John J.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isleof Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C (North'mb Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kinloch, Sir John George Smith
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mather, Sir William
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Schwann, Charles E.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Alfred Hutton and Mr. Trevleyan.

(2.30.) MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) moved an Amendment providing that the local education authority shall, "without financial discrimination between schools provided by themselves and schools not so provided," maintain and keep efficient all public elementary schools within their area under certain specified conditions. He did not mean to argue that every school indiscriminately should be treated alike, for he could conceive cases in which the cost of living in certain places might cause the salaries of teachers not to be so high as in schools elsewhere, and cases where the record of the schools was one of inefficiency. The Bill had been advocated, and indeed had also been attacked, on the ground that it would bring up voluntary schools taken over by the local authority to the same level, and would give them the same financial support, as the schools provided out of the rates. If the intention was to be carried out, this section was the proper place in which to carry it out. He submitted, however, that the words of the section did not sufficiently carry it out. The section said that the local authority was to maintain the schools in efficiency, but did not say it was to keep all schools on a like level of efficiency. He did not propose by his Amendment that there should be absolutely no discrimination. What he proposed was that no set of schools should be less adequately supported than others because they had not been provided out of the rates—in fact that, given the necessary condition of efficiency, all schools should have equal treatment. What he feared was that in some cases—no doubt rare cases—the local authority might say: "We are compelled to take these schools over, but we will not pay them more than up to the present they have already cost." The Education Department might say: "You are not maintaining these schools in a state of efficiency," but in that case the local authority might answer: "These schools you have hitherto admitted to be efficient. Why, then, do you require more of us than you have done yourselves?"

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 4, after 'shall,' to insert 'without discriminating schools provided by themselves and schools not so provided.'"—(*Mr. James Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*The SECRETARY of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) said he hoped that his hon. friend would not press the Amendment. His hon. friend suggested that the local education authority might not deal fairly with all the schools within the area; but they were bound by the Bill to maintain the efficiency of all public elementary schools. They had, through their powers of direction, complete control of secular instruction. Therefore, if the local authority was disposed to be unfair to a school, he did not see how far any words which could be inserted in the Bill could make them act fairly. Personally, he should be sorry to suggest by any words in the Bill that this Committee contemplated such an unfair discrimination between one school and another as that which the hon. Member seemed to consider possible, and he would be very unwilling to cast such a slur on the local authorities. They had the duty thrown on them to maintain the schools in a state of efficiency, satisfactory to the Board of Education, and if they said that, in their opinion, this standard of efficiency would be sufficient for one district, and that another and higher degree of efficiency was suitable to another district, the Board of Education could not intervene.

Mr. ALFRED HUTTON thought the suggestion of the hon. Member was very significant. The object of the Amendment was to prevent the educational authority from exercising any financial control. The answer of the Secretary to the Board of Education was that the Department had no means of compelling an authority to treat all its schools equally, and that if they chose to make any difference between their schools the Department had no power to prevent them. It was therefore necessary for the Committee to know how far the power to make the educational authority treat all its schools fairly lay with the Department. It would be necessary to know whether it was possible under this Clause for the County Councils to exercise the control given to them.

*Mr. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) said that this was a matter which he had had in his mind for some time, but he had always gathered that the point was fully met by sub-Section 2 of the Clause, which provided that, if any question arose between the school management and the education authority, it should be decided by the Board of Education. He took it that if the county authority refused to accept the decision of the Board of Education with regard to a dispute, the

Board could refuse the grant on account of any particular school. Because it must be borne in mind that no grants would go to the managers direct—they were to be paid to the County Authority. Another point to which he would draw attention was that this subject was frequently discussed, as though the efficiency which had to be secured were merely the efficiency of instruction. If hon. Members were doubtful as to the operation of the Clause, they should turn to the definitions in the Day School Code with regard to efficiency, and they would find that it meant much more than the character of the instruction in the school. If the efficiency was merely efficiency in instruction, things could go on in the old way, but it was not so, and some discrimination would be necessary in detail. The Board had to be satisfied that the conditions were themselves satisfactory and efficient, and this condition could not be complied with unless the various classes of schools were properly financed by the local authority. The fear raised, therefore, by the Amendment was unfounded. Nothing in the Bill removed the control of the Board of Education from these schools. The Board's power to withhold the grant would be a sufficient check upon failure.

Sir EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) said that, if the hon. Member who had just sat down was right in his interpretation of sub-Section 2, this Amendment was unnecessary. But in the summer the Prime Minister said that that sub-Section merely meant that, if the dispute between the managers and the local authority related to a question of secular education, the Board of Education would not overrule the local education authority. That was a much narrower interpretation. He thought, therefore, that if there was any misconception it was desirable that it should be cleared up at once.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE expressed the opinion that it was only right that the matter should be cleared up now, because it must have a bearing on every Amendment on this Clause. The hon. Member for North West Ham was the unofficial interpreter of the Bill on behalf of the Government. Would they accept the gospel of the hon. Member for North West Ham? This was a very serious matter. What did it mean? Not that they had more control than they thought, but less. According to the hon. Member for North West Ham they could not discriminate at all because of sub-Section 2. What did that mean? The managers of the denominational schools might say that this year they want £350 more, that their expenses were so and so; when they run up bills for that, could the central authority then say, "We cannot pay it. You are spending too much, your salaries are too high or your staff is too big," and then say "you are running up too big a bill?" In that case the school managers might say: "You are discriminating between school and school," and they would go to the clerk in the Education Department who wrote in the names of "My Lords of the Educational Department," and that particular clerk would overrule the supreme control. He would rather see the Amendment carried.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) said that the Bill was perfectly clear. It was the duty of the local education authority to maintain all schools alike, and, therefore, any words forbidding discrimination were unnecessary. If discrimination were attempted the remedy was provided under Section 11, which said that if the local authority failed to fulfil any of its duties the Board of Education should hold a public inquiry and make an order, which was to be enforced by *mandamus*.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said they were back again on the *mandamus*. The real working power of the Bill was *mandamus*, although the Committee had been told the County Councils were to be independent, and to have absolute control. He had himself called attention to sub-Section 2, upon which the hon. Member for North West Ham relied altogether to bring about this reform. The supreme power in this matter was not the County Council nor the educational authority, but the hon. Member the Secretary of the Board of Education, who sat opposite. The hon. Gentleman was a man of strong opinions, but if it was supposed that this was a satisfactory solution of the question of education when a question arose between the County Councils and the school managers, he was quite certain that that would be found to be a mistake; there would be a sentiment that the school managers were in the right. They had been told that this was a matter of decentralisation, and that if they chose to refrain from doing what they were ordered to do, the education authority had no power to compel them to do it, except by the operation of Clause 11, to which the Attorney-General had been good enough to call attention. What were they to do, supposing that the educational authority gave a direction to the managers to do something, and the managers failed or refused to do it? The Board of Education had to call them to account, and they were to hold a public inquiry into the conduct of the County Council; a public inquiry before a criminal authority. The educational authority was to be brought by the denominational managers before the Board of Education in London, and the Board of Education would conduct the business and be the prosecutor of the County Council, the education authority, and were to make such an order as they thought necessary or proper for the purpose of compelling the educational authority to fulfil their duty. Then came the *mandamus.* Who were they going to *mandamus*? The Parliamentary Grant came through the Board of Education, which was therefore the only body which was in a position of independence. If the Board of Education determined against the educational authority, and in favour of the denominational managers, the educational authority had no remedy at all, and it would continue to get the grant, though the school be conducted contrary to its direction.

(3.0.) MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said there appeared to exist on the other side the idea that after the Bill became law there would be two classes of schools, voluntary and Board. That was a complete misapprehension. There would be but one class of schools, and the local authority would be responsible for them. Of those schools, some would meet in buildings belonging to the local authority, and others in buildings belonging to the present voluntary school owners. But the school itself, and everything pertaining to it, would belong to the ratepayers, and the ratepayers alone. It was just the same as with a man's horse. Whether a man put his horse in his own stable or into a stable belonging to someone else, and paid a rent for the use of the stable, it made no difference as to the ownership of the horse. In this case, whether the school was in its own buildings, or in buildings for which a rent was paid, would make no difference, and it was a complete fallacy to suppose that schools would be voluntary schools as they were at present.

MR. JAMES HOPE said he was not entirely satisfied with what had fallen from the Secretary to the Board of Education, and he hoped that between now and the Report stage he would look further into the matter. For the moment, he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the Amendment only brought out the madness of trying to rate a community like this towards the support of Roman Catholic, of Church of England, or of any schools which were thoroughly tarred by the denominational brush. The thing was impossible; there was certain to be resistance and discrimination. Could any man believe that with public opinion excited as it was in certain districts, or in towns where religious animosity was as strong almost as in Belfast itself, it would be possible to obtain local authorities so free from prejudice that there would be no discrimination? That, however, was not an argument in favour of the present Amendment; it was an argument against the whole scheme of the Bill. Those who had had anything to do with the working of the machinery of *mandamus* knew that it was totally inapplicable to circumstances of the kind that would here arise. It was a cumbersome and difficult machinery to work even when only a single issue was at stake, as in the vaccination question, but here the remedy would be perfectly futile.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL was surprised at the observations of hon. Members with regard to *mandamus.* It appeared to be entirely forgotten that under the Act of

1870 the central authority had summary power over a School Board in default. Under that Act there existed a far more drastic remedy than that now proposed.

Mr. WALLACE (Perth) said his only objection to the procedure was that in this case it would not work, whereas the existing remedy, though it might be drastic, was certainly efficient. They could *mandamus* a man to do one particular act, but they could not *mandamus* a corporation, such as would be here involved, to perform their duty at large.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. M'KENNA moved to provide that the local education authority should "have sole control over the expenditure of all money publicly provided." His Amendment, he said, was intended to raise one aspect of the question of the relations between the local education authority and the managers. He contended that the Bill, as it now stood, allowed the voluntary school managers to incur unlimited liabilities as to teachers' salaries and equipment, and that all they would have to do would be to send in the bill, not to voluntary subscribers as of old, but to the local education authority. It was clearly implied by Clause 7 that the denominational managers would correspond with the old voluntary school managers, and, if so, their powers would include an unlimited right of spending money, and the only check would be by audit after the money had been spent. Under the present Clause the local education authority, which was bound to maintain the school, would have to pay the bills which these managers sent them, provided they had acted within the law. If that were the proper interpretation of the Clause it needed amendment. [Mr. Balfour: "Hear, hear."] There was nothing to limit the amount of money to be spent, and the local education authority could only be said to hold the purse-strings in the same way that the Boards of Guardians held them over the School Boards at present, by audit. That meant that, provided the voluntary school managers had acted within the law, although, perhaps, not wisely or with discretion, their accounts would have to be passed. Who, then, was guilty of misrepresentation as to the terms of the Bill? And was it not right to say that the Bill gave power to spend taxation without any effective control? Under these circumstances he had introduced this Amendment, which gave to the local education authority complete control over the expenditure of all money publicly provided.

Amendment proposed—

In page 3, line 4, after, "shall" to insert "have sole control over the expenditure of all money publicly provided, and shall"—*Mr. M'Kenna.*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that when the hon. Gentleman said that the Bill practically gave to the managers of voluntary schools the same power of drawing on the rates of their district as was now possessed by Board Schools, that surely was a very extravagant proposition not justified by any specific provision in the Bill, and absolutely contradictory of that broad principle that was laid down in Clause 3—that secular education should be completely under the control of the education authority. But while he did not think the hon. Gentleman had been right in his interpretation of the Bill, and he was ready to admit that on that there might be disputes, there could be no dispute whatever as to the policy of the Government. From the day on which he introduced the Bill, and on every convenient occasion until the speech he had made at Manchester, he had always stated that the object of the Government was to make the control of secular education by the education authority complete. It stood to reason that if the voluntary school managers were to be able to dip into the public purse without any control except such as the audit provided, the intention and policy of the Government, declared over and over again, would be utterly defeated. He had said at Manchester, what, of course, he could not with propriety have said in introducing the Bill, that the Government would welcome any modification of Clause 8 which would make this control of secular education more obvious and more complete; and he was not at all sure, while he differed from the hon. Gentleman in his interpretation of the Bill, that he was not so far right—he thought he was right, that it would be desirable to make it quite clear, on the very face of this Clause, that the financial control as far as secular education was concerned was and ought to be in the hands of the body which levied the rate; that was the body which ought to have control. Therefore he was only doing what he thought the Committee would desire, and what he had indicated at Manchester, when he said that as far as the principle of the hon. Gentleman's Amendment was concerned he was in sympathy with it. He thought, however, that this was not the proper place for the Amendment. If the hon. Gentleman would look at the Amendment of his hon. friend the Member for the Wellington Division of Shropshire—

"line 6, after 'necessary,' insert 'and have control of all expenditure required for that purpose other than expenditure for which, under this Act, provision is to be made by the managers,'"

he would see, he thought, that by that his object would be completely carried out, and in a manner more harmonious with the general drafting of the Bill. The Amendment he referred to was more harmonious with the general drafting of the Bill, and if the hon. Gentleman would assure the Government that he would accept that Amendment he would recommend that course to the Committee.

(3.30.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said this brought them to the discrimination between secular expenditure and denominational expenditure, and he would like to know how that discrimination was to take place. The Amendment to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred declared that the education authority was to have control over—

"All expenditure required for that purpose other than expenditure for which under this Act provision is to be made by the managers."

He did not understand what that expenditure was. Was it distinct from the general expenditure on the schools? He hoped that he might now be allowed to go into the matter of what was the province of the managers and what the majority were to do with reference to the schools. Were they to have any functions whatever after they had appointed a denominational master? Were they to interfere with the management at all? In this Amendment there was provision for certain expenditure by the managers. What was that expenditure?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: For repairs of buildings.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he was arriving exactly at what he wanted. They now knew that the four managers had no functions with reference to these schools except the repair of the buildings. He was much obliged to the Attorney-General for throwing more light upon this point than they had hitherto had.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: No, no. We are dealing only with expenditure at present. I say that the expenditure they will provide is in reference to buildings.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said that then it was important to know what would be their functions besides those in reference to buildings. The Clause was entirely defective in this matter of expenditure and in not defining the office of the managers. The whole question turned upon what the managers were to do and what they were not to do. He understood that the managers had to have control of everything that cost money. They ought to have a clause in some form or other defining the duties of the managers. They ought to be told what relation they bore to the old managers created under the Act of 1870. There was no clear definition of this point in the Bill, and until they got that clear distinction made they could not arrive at a conclusion as to what would be the character of the control of the education authority. They were told that the managers would not have authority to give any order which led to expenditure except in regard to bricks and mortar, and he hoped that in regard to that expenditure, at all events, the Archbishop of Canterbury was not an absolute interpreter of the Bill, because he had told them that, though it was not quite settled yet, the voluntary managers would not spend any money upon the schools except upon very large alterations in special circumstances, and, therefore, that there need be no annual subscription for the repairs of the schools.

MR. ALEXANDER BROWN (Shropshire, Wellington) said the Amendment standing in his name made clear what had been the intention of the Bill all through in this matter. What the ratepayers were asked to pay for under the Bill would be under the control of the education authority.

MR. BRYCE said he should like to ask one question with regard to the salary of the teachers, which would be the most important element of expenditure. Did they understand that whenever a teacher had to be appointed the managers would have to go to the local authority and obtain sanction to fix that salary at a certain figure, or would the managers be able, before they consulted the local authority, to advertise for a teacher at a certain salary? He should like to be informed whether there was any expenditure whatever which the managers could incur upon their own responsibility without referring to the local authority.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had indeed spoken in vain if he had not made it quite clear to the Committee on the many occasions on which he had addressed it that, according to his view, the staffing of the schools and the payment of the teachers' salaries were all matters within the determination of the local authority. When he had talked in the House and in the country of secular education being under popular control, he had always meant what he said. It appeared to him that the determination of the staff and the salaries of the teachers in the various schools was perhaps the most important subject with which the education authority would have to deal.

LORD HUGH CECIL suggested that the word "appropriation" was wanted either instead of, or in addition to, the word "control." They wanted the idea that the local authority should appropriate particular funds to particular expenditure. This was a technical expression which he thought, if introduced, would meet the case.

MR. M'KENNA said that if he could insert the word "sole" before "control," he would be glad to accept the Amendment. If it were also possible to insert the word "appropriation," he would be glad to accept that.

LORD HUGH CECIL thought the term "sole control" might interfere with the central control of the Board of Education.

MR. M'KENNA did not think that would affect the "sole." He suggested the word "sole" and, if possible, the word "appropriation" also.

*MR. ERNEST GRAY drew attention to the words "publicly provided," and asked whether money would be regarded as "publicly provided" in cases where the schools were supported by a voluntary rate.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not want any misunderstanding. He personally saw no objection to the word "sole," but he would not like to pledge himself to it.

MR. M'KENNA said he would reserve to himself the right to move the word "sole" when the time came.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The first of the two Amendments standing in the name of the hon. Member for Rugby is out of order, because that question has already been disposed of by Clause 6. The second Amendment standing in the hon. Member's name is in order.

*(3.50.) MR. CORRIE GRANT moved the insertion, in the first sentence of the Clause providing that the local authority shall maintain and keep efficient all public elementary schools in its area, of the words "as hereinafter defined" after the words "keep efficient." His subsequent Amendment was as follows—

> The term "keep efficient" shall be interpreted to mean "keep efficient to the satisfaction of the Board of Education." In determining the standard of efficiency the Board of Education shall take into consideration—
>
> (a) The importance of securing in all schools a continuously progressive development of the educational system and methods;

(b) The structural suitability of the buildings for educational purposes;

(c) The opportunities afforded by the local education authority and the managers of the school for the healthy recreation of the children attending it.

Those were the three main points which he thought the House would agree it was most desirable that the Board of Education should insist upon maintaining from year to year (no matter what Party happened to be in power) in dealing with the administration of public elementary schools. There was not enough definition in this Bill, for they had already had conflicting interpretations of this measure, and therefore he hoped that the Prime Minister would endeavour to make this Bill better than most measures in this respect, so that those who had to administer it would be able to do so without taking so many legal opinions. He hoped they would succeed in putting into the Bill some clear definition of the words "keep efficient." He was aiming by his Amendment to put in a definition to which every one who cared about education at all should be able to agree. The Board of Education, first of all, had to determine the standard of efficiency. That was the duty of the Board of Education now. One difficulty they experienced now was that they had to collect from a series of documents exactly what was the view of the Board of Education as regarded efficiency in education. The Cockerton judgment pointed out one case in which the Board of Education had not always had a clear and definite idea of what could be done under the Act. He wished to put the definition he had suggested on record for the guidance of those who would have to carry out the new Education Act. The structural suitability of the buildings for educational purposes had become under this Bill a most important matter. Any one who visited the schools in the rural districts must know that, however good they were when they were first built, many of them could not now be said to be suitable in many respects. There had been great carelessness in the provision of light, and many of the schools seemed to have been constructed so as to prevent them getting satisfactory light. Those connected with the management of schools must be aware that within the last twenty-five or thirty years progress in school buildings had been probably greater than in any other class of buildings. Many of the schools which passed muster in 1870 and 1880 were now only permitted because to interfere with them would deprive the locality of having any school at all. With regard to the healthy recreation of the children, no one could deny that opportunities for such recreation were absolutely necessary if the school work was to be efficiently done, and this was a matter which had been very much lost sight of in the schools built many years ago. A very great effort had been made recently to provide for the recreation of the children, but a great deal more might be done if the matter was kept persistently under the attention of the authorities.

Amendment proposed—

In page 3, line 5, after the word "efficient," to insert the words "as hereinafter defined."—(*Mr. Corrie Grant.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that he did not think the words of the Amendment were very appropriate to insert in an Act of Parliament. He thought hon. Gentlemen would feel that it was impossible to go beyond the word "efficient" as defined from time to time by the Board of Education. This had been the practice hitherto. The word "efficient" occurred already in our statutes, and "efficiency" was defined by the Board of Education. In his opinion, the word was rightly defined in this way, and not by statutory definition, because the requirements of education had in our time varied greatly. We had no reason to believe we had reached perfection, even in theory, and he was not sure that any commonplaces laid down in an Act of Parliament would help the Board of Education in the future in dealing with this point.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he did not understand the statement that under this Bill the judge of efficiency would be the Board of Education. The Government were imposing upon the local education authority the obligation of keeping all the schools efficient, but that efficiency was not to be judged by them. Under these circumstances the only real authority appeared to him to be the Board of Education in London. Therefore the statement that this Bill created an authority which they trusted was entirely unfounded.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that of course the Board must lay down a certain standard before paying a grant to the local authority, and that standard was the standard of efficiency.

(4.0.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said that the manner in which this Bill had been drawn left them absolutely in the dark as to the nature of the control which the local authority was to have. Now they were told that it was not to have control of the definition of efficiency. These local bodies could say: "If we are to have efficiency defined not by ourselves but by the Board of Education, then we decline to have anything to do with it." They had been told by the Secretary for Education that one of the great merits of this Bill was that the local bodies would be able to set up different standards of education in different communities. After what they had heard, he should like to know what became of the doctrine laid down by the First Lord of the Treasury that a standard was to be set up by the Board of Education for all parts of the country alike; because the right hon. Gentleman had stated distinctly that he was not merely as good a judge of what was wanted educationally in Bradford as the people of Bradford. All he could say was that when it became known throughout the country that the local authorities were to have a standard of efficiency settled for them, they would resent that they should not be recognised as the best judges of the character of the education to be given in their locality. The Board of Education, he maintained, had proved by their record in the past to be the worst possible judges of what was a good education. The condition of the voluntary schools in the country was proof of that. He remembered a Minister of Education, Mr. Acland, who had tried to do something for the voluntary schools, but who was laughed at in this House for his projected reforms. The Board of Education had never compelled the managers of the voluntary schools to make them efficient. When they attempted to do so, they were always met with the most determined opposition of the managers, and one of the reasons why, in his opinion, this Amendment should be pressed was because the security for efficiency proposed in the Bill seemed to him most futile.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said it might not seem strange that a representative of the recent Board of Education should intervene for a moment to correct what had been said in the course of the debate. He had never stated that there was to be a different standard of education in different parts of the country. What he had said was that there would be different kinds of education according to the necessities of the district. It was a recommendation—and a very great recommendation—of this Bill that the local authorities having charge of education in various parts of the country would be able to give that kind of education which was required in those particular parts of the country. With regard to efficiency, the duty of maintaining it had, in recent years, been thrown upon the Board of Education. The Board were entrusted with the expenditure of many millions of money, and they would have committed a breach of their national duty if they did not see that the schools were reasonably efficient before paying over the money. No doubt there were many schools in the country in which the efficiency was capable of improvement, but there had been no case where the Board of Education had ever paid, except as temporary grants, a grant to a school which was believed to be, and found by the inspectors to be, inefficient. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had advanced propositions which were not capable of proof, and had certainly attributed to him statements which he had never made.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that one advantage the House had derived from the altered geographical position of the right hon. Gentleman was that, for the first time in the past ten years, he had been able to perform the functions of a Minister of Education. [Cries of "Oh, oh," and "Withdraw."] He meant in this House. [Renewed cries of "Oh, oh," and "Withdraw."] If he had said anything offensive to the right hon. Gentleman he would certainly withdraw. What he meant was that the right hon. Gentleman had not had that freedom to express his opinions as the Minister of Education which they thought he ought to have had. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the grants had been withdrawn from voluntary schools which were regarded as efficient. He put it to the right hon. Gentleman—Did he mean to say that the grants had been withdrawn from every school which was unfit, badly ventilated, and ill-equipped? They knew perfectly well that there were thousands of schools in this country in that condition to which grants had been made. He did not know whether the inspectors failed to report the condition of these schools, or whether there was some reason why they did not so report. One result of the Bill would be that something like two or three millions of money would be spent on education in the voluntary schools if the Act were put in operation; but there was nothing in the Bill to induce the local authorities to improve the education throughout their districts, and that was a justification for his hon. friend to move his Amendment, which called upon these local authorities to improve the buildings of the voluntary schools, some of which were not fit for little children to be imprisoned in, in pens, each and every day of their lives. The condition of many of these schools depressed the energies of the children, ruined their vitality, and sowed the seeds of disease. When they were voting more money for these voluntary schools they ought to have an interpretation in the Bill as to what was an improved system of education. The Prime Minister had given too many promises, and had put them in his perorations. What was wanted was something more than perorations. It was time that the right hon. Gentleman's perorations should be interpreted in something like the manner in which his hon. friend had interpreted them. He asked his right hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education whether there was a single phrase in this Bill which would enable the Board of Education to see that these schools were efficient.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON: Sub-Section (*d*) in Clause 8.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that that sub-Section simply declared what burdens should fall upon the managers of the school; it did not say that the managers should repair the schools, and should keep them in good repair. The interpretation of the Archbishop of Canterbury was—[Cries of "Read the Bill"] Let him complete his sentence. If necessary he would read the Bill afterwards — the interpretation of the Primate was that that was a thing of such little importance that it would not be necessary to call upon the subscribers for money except once in ten years or so. The sub-Section of Clause 8 said—

> "The managers of the school shall, out of funds provided by them, keep the school house in good repair, and make such alterations and improvements in the building as may be reasonably required by the local education authority."

What was that but simply a power which they had at the present moment, and which had not been exercised, and under which there were thousands of absolutely inefficient schools. Let them make it a condition that efficiency was interpreted in such a way that the little children should not be driven into insanitary buildings to the prejudice of their health.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said he was very glad that this Amendment had been moved, since it had led to an exceedingly useful discussion. He would not say anything against the administration of the County Councils, because he was a member of one himself; but he ventured to maintain that even if he held the highest view of the future administrative skill of the County Councils of England, he would not be able to blind himself to the fact that there were County Councils and County Councils, Boards of Guardians and Boards of Guardians, to whom the Board of Education ought to give a clear direction as to the maintenance and equipment in an efficient manner of their schools. In connection with the Amendment, he would like to take the opportunity of asking the Government to tell the Committee what had become of the chapter in the Code relating to building grants. For the first time that chapter had disappeared from the Code this year, although it had formerly enabled the Education Department to lay down rules in regard to the improvement demanded in the buildings of the schools.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that in reply to the hon. Member who had moved this Amendment, he wished to express his own strong feeling of the undesirability of putting a standard of efficiency, as was proposed in the Amendment, into an Act of Parliament. It would be much better to move to reduce his salary, or that of the President of the Board of Education, and to raise questions on every possible occasion, and to secure efficiency in that way, than to put into the Bill words which would fix a minimum of efficiency. That was all he had to say in regard to the general point. As to the building rules, these had been carefully revised.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE: Will they be laid before the Committee?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: They will be laid before the Committee.

*MR. FLETCHER MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston) said he was sure that in this matter hon. Members on both sides of the House had one aim, and that was to secure that the efficiency of the schools should be real. There was one thing worse than a bad Act of Parliament, and that was an uncertain one. He wanted to set forth the reason why he thought there should be some defining word with regard to efficiency. He did not claim that the terms of the Amendment of his hon. friend were the only words that would accomplish the desired result, but if the words were "efficient to the satisfaction of the Board of Education," that would satisfy him. There ought to be some standard of efficiency that could be readily enforced. It should be an elastic standard of efficiency—elastic in such a way that the advancing views of the country, from time to time, might be reflected in the actual management of the schools. A number of his hon. friends on the other side had, in perfectly good faith, referred to sub-Section (*d*) of Clause 8. If they would kindly follow him, he thought he could show that that was a completely insufficient answer to the objection that efficiency was not defined, because that sub-Section only applied to schools not provided by the local authority. What they wanted to do was to keep the local authority to their duty, and the provision which his hon. friends relied upon with such confidence as creating what was wanted, only referred to that class of schools not provided by the local authority. But there was a further reason. The words of the sub-Section only required the managers to obey the local authority; but they did not define the duty of the local authority. He suggested that either now, or at the Report stage, or at some other time, the Government should put in the Bill an immediately enforceable and immediately interpretable standard of efficiency. He was perfectly certain that if they left it as at present, simple "efficiency," without any administrative (as contrasted with a judicial) power of deciding what was efficiency, they made it possible to have endless delays and endless controversies as to what was efficiency.

MR. M'KENNA said that on the previous day they had had a most interesting speech from the hon. Member for West Ham, who had given the Committee a description of the lamentable condition of many of the voluntary schools. These were largely out of repair, and not efficient. Now the only sanction for efficiency in the Clause as it stood was that of the Education Department, but that Department was responsible for the inefficiency of these schools during the past thirty years. Were they not, therefore, justified in saying, after an experience of thirty years, that they required some other definition of efficiency than that interpreted by the Board of Education? He agreed with what had been said by his hon. friend that if they desired that the school buildings should be kept up to date and in good repair, seeing they had only voluntary subscribers to rely upon, some other authority should be substituted for the Board of Education. For that reason he supported the Amendment.

(4.23.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 87; Noes, 212. (Division List No. 392.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Langley, Batty
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Priestley, Arthur
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Corrie Grant and Mr. J. H. Whitley.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Campbell, Rt. Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (D'rbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A (Worc'r
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn. G. R C Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Manners, Lord Cecil
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (I. of Wight)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sh'ffi'ld
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood & Mr. Anstruther.

(4.37.) MR. ALFRED HUTTON moved to insert after "efficient" the words "as regards secular instruction." He stated that the object of the Amendment was to make the local education authority completely responsible for all the financial arrangements with regard to the schools. He proposed the insertion of these words in order to provide that the money would be properly distributed by the Committee, and devoted only to purposes which had relation to the teaching of secular instruction. The point which he wished to make was this. It was quite possible that in schools of both classes some expense would be involved in carrying out the religious instruction. Supposing, for instance, in the case of Board Schools the pre-emption clause were accepted, there would then be a considerable amount of expense in relation to the teaching of creeds, catechisms, and the like. Not only would that be so in these schools, but also in other schools there would be the expense of prayer-books, catechisms, and various other religious books. These were things that ought to be kept perfectly clear and distinct in the matter of public finance. He thought the First Lord of the Treasury could not have any objection to inserting the words, so that it would be made perfectly clear that the local education authority would be financially responsible only for secular instruction, and that they should in no way be financially responsible for the expense of sectarian or religious teaching in the schools.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no idea that the local authority shall mix themselves up with the religious training or teaching in any of the denominational schools. On the contrary, both the hon. Gentleman and the upholders of the voluntary schools are absolutely agreed on that point. It is merely a question of drafting. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will allow me to accept it provisionally. I do not think there is any doubt about the meaning. It can be carried out at a later stage.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON assented to the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Our discussion has run so much on the voluntary schools, that I forgot for the moment that this Clause has a wider application. As regards the voluntary schools I entirely agree, but I do not think the hon. Member wishes it to apply to the board schools.

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said there was some distinction between the two cases, and he thought the distinction would be better made later on in another part of the Bill. It should remain lawful for the School Board to purchase copies of the Bible and such hymn-books and text-books for teachers of Scripture history as were wanted for instruction under the Cowper-Temple Clause, while it should be unlawful to spend public money for religious instruction outside the Clause. The best plan would be for the Prime Minister to give a pledge to consider how the object of his hon. friend could be attained.

MR. MCKENNA said the whole of this Clause was bad, and suggested that it should be reconstructed in such a manner as to give effect to the proposal of his hon. friend.

MR. BRYCE concurred with the hon. Member for West Nottingham that there was a distinction between the two classes of schools. They were all agreed that there should be liberty in the case of ex-board schools to purchase books for religious instruction. They were all agreed that there should be no such power in the case of sectarian schools where any expenditure of money could be represented as given for sectarian purposes. He did not say whether this should be made clear by a new Clause, or by a sub-Clause, but he thought the Committee should have some assurance on the part of the Government that the point would receive consideration.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no difference of opinion between hon. Gentleman opposite and the Government. I rather doubt whether any Amendment is necessary, but the matter will have the consideration of the Government.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON: After the promise of the right hon. Gentleman I ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment by leave, withdrawn.

(4.45.) MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) moved the insertion of the words "in their opinion" after "are," in line 3 of Clause 8, the object being to secure that the question whether particular schools were necessary should be left to the decision of the local education authority. He did not think that the words "which are necessary" in the Clause should be used without some qualification as to who was to decide what was necessary. The words he proposed to introduce were taken from the Act of 1870, and they would make it clear that the local education authority should in the first instance be the authority to decide whether a school was necessary or not. It might be said that Clause 10 of the Bill would meet the case, but that Clause dealt entirely with disputes, and they ought to try to frame the Bill so that there would be as few disputes as possible. Even if this Amendment were accepted, Clause 10 could still stand to supply the proper authority to decide in the case of disputes. In the Act of 1870 the question of necessity was dealt with boldly in a clause which was done away with under the present Bill. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accept the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 6, after the word "are," to insert the words "in their opinion."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I hope the hon. Gentleman will not press for the insertion of these words. By Clause 10 of the Bill any question that arises as to whether a further school is necessary or not is to be determined by the Board of Education. The effect of these words would be to make the local education authority the supreme and final judge in their area whether a school was necessary or not. I think the Committee will be of opinion that it is desirable to follow the practice which has hitherto prevailed of leaving to the Board of Education the controlling power in order that tolerable uniformity of action may be obtained. I submit to the Committee that the lines on which the Bill is drawn are much better than would be the lines which would follow if this Amendment were insisted upon.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN said he had no doubt that the interpretation of the hon. and learned Gentleman was correct, namely, that the putting in of the words "in their opinion" would preclude any review under Section 10. If that was the case, he still thought it extremely desirable that the Amendment should be made. The whole aim of the Bill was decentralisation, but if the Bill remained as it was framed the Board of Education would be the sole arbiter on the question whether a school was necessary or not. He thought the Government would be acting in accordance with one of the main principles of the Bill if they accepted the Amendment.

MR. TREVELYAN said the question here raised was that which would be considered when they came to deal with Clauses 9 and 10. It practically amounted to this, whether sectarian schools should be built over the head of the local education authority. It was pretty obvious what would happen in the case of a dispute if any small section wanted to build a school. They would always go to the Board of Education, and, if they had friends on that Board, the local authority would be overridden. The Amendment only sought to strengthen the hands of the local authority against the Board of Education, if it chose to take the part of the separate sections. The question raised by Clauses 9 and 10 was one of the most important in the Bill. It was also one of the most objectionable features. The idea contained in these clauses was that it was desirable in order to settle the religious difficulty in the different districts that the children should be divided into sectarian pens, and brought up as little budding sectarians. This Amendment was directed against that, and he would, therefore, vote for it.

MR. WHITLEY said he intended to vote for the Amendment on purely educational grounds. There was nothing worse for children than having small schools. The Bill contemplated that a school with thirty children should be considered a necessary school. There were many places in the country where it was very desirable that small schools should be closed and the children brought together in larger schools. He read some time ago an article in one of the magazines on the development that had gone on in the rural districts of America in the direction of bringing scholars together, instead of maintaining small and costly schools. Public conveyances were provided to collect the children from the scattered farm-houses, bring them to school, and take them home again. The article was written by an inspector of the American Education Department, and he gave very striking figures and opinions as to the immense benefit that system had been to education in the rural districts. In the larger schools there was more stimulus to competition, and greater possibility of having an efficient staff.

*MR. FLETCHER MOULTON said he thought he would be able to show that, in the most important point raised by this Amendment, the provisions of the Bill were inadequate. There was no difference of object between the Attorney General and himself. He should be exceedingly sorry to take away from the Board of Education the power to establish uniformity of standard throughout the kingdom, and if the introduction of this Amendment would have that effect he should certainly not support it. He would, however, point out that Clause 10, on which the

Attorney General relied, began with the words "In case of dispute." To a dispute there must be two parties. No doubt the local authority was one of the parties, but nowhere was there to be found in the Bill any provision defining the other party? Could a casual informer come and make a dispute and compel the local education authority to go before the Board of Education for a decision? If this were so there might at any time be a dispute which would put in question any act of the local authority. It was therefore most important that there should be a provision in the Bill giving the local authority the *primâ facie* right to decide. It was also necessary that the provisions with regard to the dispute should be more carefully drafted and more elaborate. In Clause 10 they must have some words defining who were to be the parties to a dispute. He was sure the Attorney-General would not think that in saying this he was attempting to put difficulties in the way of attaining the object the Government claimed to have in view.

(5.0.) MR. M'KENNA said that, as the Attorney-General was aware, Section 5 of the Act of 1870 disappeared, and also the last part of Section 18 was repealed as far as the present discussion was concerned. Therefore, to define the meaning of the word "necessary" they would only have the first part of Section 18. The Committee would see that the Amendment of his hon. friend was in accordance with Section 18, which said that the School Boards should maintain efficiently every school, and should from time to time provide such additional accommodation as was "in his opinion necessary." Clause 10 provided for cases of dispute, but between whom was not mentioned. They had to make a choice of one of two principles. Either they should restore Clause 5 of the Act of 1870, and make it the duty of the local education authority to provide school accommodation for every child, in which case the words would not be necessary, or they should confine themselves to the first part of Section 18 of the Act, in which case the words would be necessary. Clause 10 was altogether insufficient to guide the local authority in coming to a reasonable conclusion, and therefore he would support the Amendment.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that what his hon. and learned friend opposite said in reference to Clause 10 would, of course, receive that respectful consideration which anything his hon. and learned friend suggested deserved. His present impression, however, was that the Clause as it stood was sufficient. The point suggested by the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Monmouth had not escaped attention, and if the hon. Gentleman would look at the notice Paper he would see that his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education had put down an Amendment making it clear that there would be no liability on the local authority in the matter.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he desired to call attention to the view taken by the Government of their new education authority. The Government were placing the control of education in the hands of self-governing bodies as the County Councils and the Borough Councils. One would have thought that if there was any subject on which bodies of that kind were fit to judge it would be what schools were necessary within their areas. All that was said now or on sub-Section 2, or that would be said in Clause 9 and Clause 10 about future schools, was and would be based on the assumption that those bodies were unfitted to discharge the duties to be put upon them. Any body which was not to determine what new schools were necessary, or what old schools were unnecessary, within its area was unfitted to be a great educational authority. Up to the present they had a kind of haphazard method by which schools were set up here, there, and everywhere, without regard to distribution. Now the Government claimed to be setting up a new single national authority for the co-ordination of the education of the country, and yet it was to be set forth in the Bill that that authority was not capable of finally deciding what schools were or were not necessary in its own area. That was a condemnation of the whole principle of the Bill, and to refer such a matter to the Education Department was to lay down that the local authority was incapable of discharging one of its first duties. Who would dispute the right of the local authority? It would be the private adventurers who managed the voluntary schools and who would ask the Education Department to declare that the local authority was unfit to discharge its duties. The moment he saw the Bill he thought it was dictated by an internal distrust in the authority that was to be created under it, and that was why the Government thought it right at every stage of the Bill to give to the Education Department in London power to overrule and set aside the local authority as not being fit to form a judgment in such matters. If the Government were right, it was the severest censure they could place upon the character of the new authorities they were creating.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Not at all so severe as the censure of a precisely similar kind which the Liberal Government of 1870 placed upon the School Boards which they themselves created.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.E.) said that as the representative of a rural constituency who had had an opportunity of seeing the work of small schools, he hoped the Bill, with such Amendments as would render these Board Schools more efficient, would be passed. It was absolutely impossible to have efficient education in the rural districts in the very small schools that there existed. In such a school they would find a teacher with perhaps children from five to fourteen years of age in all standards. He was quite aware that it was most desirable that where compulsion existed the schools should be as near as possible to the children, especially to the infants, and he believed it would be economical even to devise methods of getting the children to the schools rather than to spend——

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think that the hon. Gentleman's remarks are really relevant to the Amendment before the Committee. The Amendment is as to who is to decide, the local education authority or the Board of Education.

MR. GEORGE WHITE said that he was attempting to show that if they gave the local authorities power to do this they would be so impressed with the necessity of it that they would be bound to do it in the interests of education and in the interests of the teachers. It was manifest that there should be greater power centred in the local authority, who would have the opportunity on the spot of seeing the disadvantages of these very small schools. If the authority thought that the schools were too far away from the children they ought to have the power of gathering the children to a centre, both to the advantage of the children themselves and to the teaching profession, as well as to the advantage of education all round. He would, therefore, support the Amendment.

MR. LOUGH said that the Attorney-General stated he would pay attention to the argument of the hon. and learned Member for the Launceston Division, but that only referred to one part of the Amendment, and that, in his opinion, the least important. The hon. and learned Member pointed out that the local authority might be in peril in carrying out its duties if some such Amendment were not included. There had been a great many cases recently, especially in London, where the local authority was surcharged for exceeding its powers. That was the danger he wished to guard against. The local authority might be held responsible for work which it carried out, and no standard was laid down in the Bill by which the question could be decided. Surely the harmless words he proposed would be a great help. They would only give the power to decide the matter *primâ facie*, and if any one wanted to question the decision there remained Clause 10. He was following the exact precedent of Section 18 of the Act of 1870. He really thought that if the Committee would give the matter more attention they would admit the Amendment, which would be a great improvement to the Bill.

(5.13) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 82; Noes, 199. (Division List No. 393.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Priestley, Arthur
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomson, F. W (York, W. R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—
Mr. Lough and Mr. D. A. Thomas.

NOES.

Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hambro, Charles Eric

Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George

Pryce-Jones, Lt-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscouut
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffi'ld
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Committee report progress, to sit again on Monday next.

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-seven minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 20th October, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

IMPRISONMENT OF A MEMBER.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following letter relating to the Imprisonment of a Member—

> Sligo,
> 17th Oct., 1902.
>
> Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that Mr. Patrick Aloysius M'Hugh, M.P. for North Leitrim, was yesterday convicted of conspiracy and intimidation and sentenced by me and Mr. Harrell, R.M., to a term of two calendar months imprisonment in Sligo Gaol with hard labour. Against this conviction Mr. M'Hugh has appealed to the next Quarter Sessions here, which begin on 25th inst.
>
> I have the honour to be, Sir,
> Your obedient servant,
> ROBERT L. BROWN, R.M.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S): In this case the conviction took place on Thursday or Friday. Now, Sir, is it not within your knowledge that Mr. M'Hugh has appealed and is out of custody? I again ask under what circumstances the fact of the arrest of several other hon. Gentlemen who have been imprisoned has not in the same way been communicated to you.

*MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest to the hon. Member that, as there are Questions on the Paper intended to elicit information on this point, he would do well to defer raising the question until they have been answered.

*MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I was in the Court at Birr on September 23, when two hon. Members were sentenced to imprisonment by two Removable Magistrates, and I desire to ask the Speaker whether he has received any communication in respect of the two hon. Members.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have received an intimation in regard to the hon. Member for the Birr Division, and also as to another hon. Member whose name I cannot, at the moment, remember.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

BAKER STREET AND WATERLOO RAILWAY BILL [LORDS].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

BROMPTON AND PICCADILLY CIRCUS RAILWAY (NEW LINES, ETC.) BILL [LORDS].

(KING'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED.)—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

CHARING CROSS, EUSTON, AND HAMPSTEAD RAILWAY (CONSOLIDATED) BILL [LORDS].

(KING'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED.) — Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

NORTH-WEST LONDON RAILWAY BILL [LORDS].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

RAILWAY BILLS.

Ordered, That the Committee on Group 12 of Railway Bills be revived, and that they have leave to sit and proceed with the remaining Bills in the Group, to-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

LANARKSHIRE (MIDDLE WARD DISTRICT) WATER ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

DUMBARTON CORPORATION (FURTHER POWERS) ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Considered; to be read the third time upon Wednesday.

WATER PROVISIONAL ORDER.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under The Gas and Water Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Marlow Water, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Hayes Fisher.

WATER PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under The Gas and Water Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Marlow Water," presented.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Ordered, That Standing Order 193A be suspended, and that the Bill be read the first time.—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour*).

Bill accordingly read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 297].

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for the abolition of restrictions: From Rugby; Maidenhead; Canonby; Earley; Cargrave; Barnoldswick; Cowes; Worcester; Summerseat; Denton; Marylebone; Irvine; Hyde; Hollingworth; Chelmsford; Alltwen; Exeter; Brentwood; Holyhead; Saffron Walden; Aberdare; Bradford; Cathcart; Pollokshaws; Cambridge; West Stanley; Consett; Shotley Bridge; Annfield Plain; Farnworth; Glasgow; Fleetwood; Hulme; Fylde; Walmer; Blackpool; Blaina; Lees; Guiseley; Tunbridge; Bingley; Tipton; Leith; and Ripley; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Pendleton, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: From Maidenhead; Speenhamland; Cowes; Denton; Canonby; Cargrave; Colne; Barnoldswick; Summerseat; Marylebone; Irvine; Hollingworth; Hyde; Worcester; Rugby; Alltwen and Pontardawe; Holyhead; Saffron Walden; Aberdare; Bradford; Cambridge; West Stanley; Consett; Shotley Bridge; Annfield Plain; Farnworth and Kearsley; Glasgow; Fleetwood; Fylde; Walmer Bridge; Blackpool; Lees and Cross Roads; Blaina; Guiseley; Tunbridge Wells; Tipton; Leith; Exeter; Ripley; Chelmsford; Hulme; and Brentwood; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Montrose, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PARISH COUNCIL LOANS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Montrose, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: From Rugby; Maidenhead; Cowes; Summerseat; Denton; Marylebone; Canonley; Gargrave; Earley; Barnoldswick; Irvine; Hyde; Hollingworth; Worcester; Alltwen; Farnworth; Holyhead; Saffron Walden; Aberdare; Lees; Hume; Exeter; Bradford; Pollokshaws; Cathcart; Cambridge; West Stanley; Consett; Shotley Bridge; Annfield Plain; Glasgow; Fleetwood; Fylde; Walmer; Blackpool; Blaina; Guiseley; Tunbridge Wells; Tipton; Leith; Brentwood; Bingley; Ripley; and Chelmsford; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Heywood, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 AND 1896.

Copy presented, of Two Orders dated the 1st September, 1902, entitled respectively, the Bristol (Cumberland Tidal Basin) Foreign Animals Wharf Revocation Order of 1902, and the Bristol (Cumberland Basin) Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CHINA (No. 2, 1902).

Copy presented, of Despatch from His Majesty's Special Commissioner enclosing the Treaty between Great Britain and China, signed at Shanghai 5th September, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES

India—Public Sale of Confidential Government Documents.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that in a catalogue recently issued by a London bookseller a number of papers issued by the Indian Government and marked confidential, among them being Routes in Central Asia, compiled under the orders of Lord Roberts, in six volumes, and other volumes compiled in the Intelligence Branch of the Quartermaster General's Department, were offered for sale; and whether steps will be, or have been, taken to prevent the recurrence of a public sale of Indian Government confidential reports; and if the offence is not punishable under existing Acts, whether the necessary powers will be sought for by fresh legislation.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) My attention was drawn to the catalogue in question, and steps were taken to prevent such of the books as were still of a confidential nature from passing into improper hands. The books in question appear to have passed out of official custody many years ago. During more recent years stricter regulations have been in force to prevent Indian Government reports of a confidential character getting into the market. I am advised that, under certain circumstances, if an officer of Government offered such books for sale, it might be possible to charge him with breach of trust under The Official Secrets Act, 1889, and that the advertisement and sale of such books might, in certain circumstances, be restrained by injunction. I am not aware that any fresh legislation on this subject is proposed in this country.

Afghanistan—Purchase of Arms, etc., in Germany.

SIR SEYMOUR KING: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether a consignment of arms purchased in Germany by the Ameer's agent, consisting of a battery of twelve quick-firing mountain guns, two howitzers, eighteen field pieces, and over 850 cases of ammunition and other war material, has been landed at Kurrachee *ex* the Hansa liner "Wartburg" and forwarded to Peshawur *en route* for Cabul; and whether it is consistent with the relations of the Afghan and British Governments that a portion of the British subsidy should be employed in purchasing arms in Germany and conveying them to their destination across British territory.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) It is the case that the late Amir of Afghanistan purchased in Germany certain guns and munitions of war. This transaction is not inconsistent with the Agreement entered into by the late Amir and His Majesty's Government.

Corn, Sugar, and Coal Export Duties.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the amount which has been received for import duties on corn and sugar, and for export duties on coal during the three quarters of the present financial year which expired on the 30th September last.

(*Answered by Mr. Ritchie.*) One-half only of the financial year had expired on the 30th September, and the amounts collected during that period were as follows:—

Corn, etc. . . .	£1,183,337
Sugar	1,991,852
Coal	963,365

Soldier Convicts in Civil Prisons.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, if he will state the number of soldiers now undergoing punishment in the local and convict prisons of the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. Akers-Douglas.*) The number is 450 (431 in local and 19 in convict prisons.)

Lewes Naval Prison.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, whether, having regard to the fact that the prison now used as a naval prison at Lewes was condemned as unfit for a local or convict prison, he will state the grounds upon which this prison is used for men in His Majesty's Navy who have been sentenced for disciplinary offences.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) I am not aware of the circumstances to which the hon. Member alludes in the first part of his Question, but they must have occurred many years ago, as Lewes has been used as a naval prison for forty years. It was selected for the purpose after consultation with the Home Office, and, with the additions and alterations made from time to time in the accommodation, it has always been found suitable. The reports of the visitors, and the results of the periodical inspections by the Commander in Chief, Portsmouth, and the Medical Director General of the Navy, are quite satisfactory, and the health of the prisoners has always been very good.

Kish Lightship—Constitution of Irish Lights Board.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether he is aware that some time since the mail steamer "Leinster" ran down the Kish Lightship; and, seeing that it is alleged that the system of warning vessels from the lightship is defective, he can state if any steps are being taken to render it effective; and if the Government have any intention of introducing a Bill to amend the system under which the Irish Lights Board are nominated.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) Shortly after the occurrence of the casualty at Kish Bank, the Board of Trade asked the Commissioners of Irish Lights to consider the possibility of improving the system of warning vessels from the lightship, and have been assured that the matter will receive every attention. The reply to the concluding part of the hon. Member's Question is in the negative.

Foreshore Rights, Stoney Estate, Mallaranny, Mayo.

Dr. ROBERT AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether he is aware that the owner of Rostock Castle, county Mayo, is prosecuting migratory labourers for gathering seaweed on the foreshore of the Stoney Estate, near Mallaranny, county Mayo, and that this estate has been sold by the owner to the Congested Districts Board, and that, during the negotiations for purchase, the Congested Districts Board refused to entertain his title to the foreshore, he being unable to produce any title: And, seeing that these rights belong to the Crown, will he, in order to protect these people who are harvesting in England and Scotland at present, see that the Crown will be represented at the trial at the next Quarter Sessions in Castlebar, and that its rights are finally asserted.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I understand that the statements in the first paragraph of the hon. Member's Question are generally correct. The Board of Trade will be represented at the trial at Castlebar on the 27th instant.

Russia and Afghanistan—Recent Diplomatic Communications.

Sir SEYMOUR KING: To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether the Government has any information, either through its diplomatic agents in Russia, or through the agents of the Government of India, or otherwise, of any intention or endeavours on the part of the Russian Government to establish diplomatic or commercial relations with Afghanistan, or to obtain Russian influence in that country; whether he can give the House an assurance that no demands to this effect, either in this country, in India, or in Afghanistan, have been brought to the knowledge of the British or Indian Governments, whether confidentially or otherwise; and whether it continues to be an understanding between the Russian and British Governments that Afghanistan is to remain outside the sphere of Russian influence.

(*Answered by Viscount Cranborne.*) His Majesty's Government have received a communication from the Russian Government proposing that direct relations should be established between Russia and Afghanistan with regard to frontier matters. It was stated that these relations would have no political character, as the Russian Government maintained their former engagements, and continued to consider Afghanistan as being outside the sphere of Russian influence. His Majesty's Government, having regard to the understanding by which Afghanistan is outside the sphere of Russian influence, have replied that it would be impossible for them to take into consideration any change in existing arrangements, or to frame proposals to be brought before the Ameer without some more precise explanation in regard to the method which the Russian Government would desire to see adopted for the exchange of such communications between the frontier officials, the limitations to be placed on them, and the means of insuring that those limitations would be observed. To this communication no answer has yet been received.

Conduct of Police at Limerick.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that notices, calling a meeting of the citizens of Limerick on the 8th of September last, to welcome Mr. P. J. Linnane, J.P., and Mr. O'Sulivan on their release from Limerick Jail, after serving a term of three months imprisonment under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, were torn down and defaced by the police; and will he state by whose authority did the police act.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The notices were removed by the police in the belief that they were of an illegal character. The police acted in error, and were so informed. Full instructions on the point have since been issued to the force.

Liscannor Harbour, Clare.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, if he will state when the provisions of the Marine Works (Ireland) Bill, in respect to Liscannor Harbour, county Clare, are likely to be carried out.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) At an early date. It is necessary, as the hon. Member is aware, to come to an understanding with the County Council, and also with persons pecuniarily interested, who may reasonably be asked to contribute in money or otherwise. In the case of Liscannor it is also necessary to confer with the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction.

Proclamation of Queen's County—Crime Statistics.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether, seeing that the last Quarterly Return of Agrarian Outrages in Ireland shows that no offence was committed in Queen's County during the three months preceding the 30th June last, that the Return for the quarter ending 31st March, 1902, shows a similar blank, and that the Chairman of the County Council and other local magistrates have protested against the proclamation of the county under The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, he proposes to recommend the withdrawal of the proclamation of the county.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) There have been five agrarian outrages in the Queen's County since the 30th June, namely, two cases of injury to cattle and one of injury to property in July, one injury to property in August, and a threatening notice in October. It is not at present proposed to withdraw the proclamation.

Staigue Fort, Castle Cove, Kerry.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether the attention of the Board of Works or other public Department has been called to the condition of Staigue Fort, one of the stone forts in Ireland, which is situate near Castle Cove, county Kerry; and whether the necessary steps will be taken, by the erection of a door, or otherwise, to prevent the stones being dislodged by cattle.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) This fort was recently placed in the custody of the Board of Public Works by the owner. The Board is aware of its condition, and has given directions for the erection of a gate to prevent damage to the structure by cattle.

Closing of Irish County Prisons.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he can state the number of prisons in Ireland, originally classed as county prisons, which were closed last December on the order of the General Prisons Board; and whether he can say in what districts or localities these prisons were situated.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) There were five such prisons, situated at Carrick-on-Shannon, Enniskillen, Mullingar, Omagh, and Wicklow.

Irish Local Government Board—Mr. T. P. Nolan.

MR. FLYNN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he can say what position is occupied by Thomas Patrick Nolan in the employment of the Local Government Board, and what are his duties; whether he is required under the conditions of service to give his entire time to the duties of the office; and, is it in accordance with the regulations of the Board that Mr. Nolan should occupy a position on a local paper, and also act as handwriting expert at trials in different parts of Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Mr. Nolan is employed as a clerk in the department of the Local Government Board, and performs such clerical duties as may be assigned to him by the Board. The only regulation bearing on the subject of his employment is that contained in Orders in Council, dated 21st March 1890, and 15th August 1890, and is as follows:—

> No officer shall be allowed to accept any part in the management of any society, or any trading, commercial, or financial company, of whatever description, which would require the attendance of such officer at any time between the hours of 10 a.m. and 6 p.m.

I am not aware whether he is in any way connected with any newspaper. His attendance at courts of justice as a handwriting expert was only permitted occasionally when it did not interfere with the discharge of his official duties.

Irish Agriculture—Basic Slag.

MR. EDWARD BARRY (Cork Co., S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that a quantity of basic slag has recently been imported into Ireland for use as a fertilizer, which, though represented as being of the standard quality, is so inferior as to be little better than ground brick-dust; whether he is aware that the wholesale merchant who sold this slag to buyers in Ireland has instituted a prosecution against the foreign exporter; will he state what steps are being taken by the Department of Agriculture in Ireland to put in force the provisions of the Fertilizer and Feeding Stuffs Act, and to ensure that this article is not being supplied to the farmers of Ireland as genuine 38–45 per cent. quality, which the brand upon the bags purports it to be.

(*Answered by Mr Wyndham.*) It has been represented to the Department that a quantity of inferior basic slag has recently been imported into Ireland, and the attention of the Department has been drawn to a newspaper report of the prosecution referred to in the Question. The Department is inquiring into the matter with a view to such further action being taken as may be practicable in the circumstances.

Admission to Theatres of Soldiers in Uniform.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether his attention has been directed to the case of a private in the Foot Guards having been refused admission to a London theatre on account of his uniform, and whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter with reference to opposing the licence or otherwise.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I have had private information of this occurrence, but have not received a report from any of the regiments in London, as the case has not been identified. I understand the managers of the theatre in question maintain that the exclusion was only from a part of the theatre reserved for those in evening dress. Uniform is an equivalent of every dress, and if this principle is not recognised by theatrical managers I shall take such legal steps as I may be advised to secure soldiers against a recurrence of such exclusion.

Grievances of Discharged Reservists.

SIR CHARLES M'LAREN (Leicestershire, Bosworth): To ask the Secretary of State for War, if his attention has been called to the public meeting in London of discharged Reservists, and to the grievances of which they complain; and will he say what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick*). My attention has been drawn to the public meeting referred to by the hon. Member. The regulations for the prompt payment of all claims are most explicit, and some weeks ago orders were issued that a return should be made from each district of any claim a month overdue. Inquiries have been promptly made into all individual cases of grievances which have reached me. A large number have been found to be unfounded, but in cases where delay has unavoidably occurred prompt action has been taken. As regards employment, the War Office have taken the only action in their power by laying it open to all men who cannot find employment to return to the colours for short periods. I need hardly add how earnestly I hope that all employers will second our endeavours by giving the preference to Reservists in regard to any places they have open.

Continental Military Long-Distance Rides —Participation of British Officers.

MR. JACOBY (Derbyshire, Mid.): To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether his attention has been called to the fact that a lieutenant of the Royal Field Artillery took part in the military ride from Brussels to Ostend, a distance of upwards of eighty miles, on 27th August, on which occasion it is stated that his horse was so exhausted that it was necessary to destroy it; whether this officer was authorised by his superiors to become a competitor on this occasion; whether any notice has been taken of this officer's action; and whether steps have been, or will be, taken to prevent British officers from taking part in such competitions in future.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for War, if he will say whether officers are required to ask permission before engaging in an international sporting contest; whether a lieutenant of the Royal Field Artillery asked permission to take part in the ride from Brussels to Ostend; whether the participation of a British officer in such a performance has the sanction of the Commander-in-Chief; and whether any communication has been addressed to this officer on the subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) A lieutenant of the Royal Field Artillery did take part in this ride, after duly obtaining leave to travel abroad for this purpose. Instructions have since been issued by the Commander-in-Chief to General Officers Commanding that he was of opinion that British officers should not take part in these competitions, as he failed to see that any good result could ensue from them.

Remounts—Hungarian Purchases.

MR. NORMAN: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he is aware that after the first purchase of Hungarian horses, General Truman was visited by a Hungarian gentleman well qualified to give advice upon the subject, and advised to purchase from a different source, and that the same gentleman subsequently tendered similar advice at personal interviews to Lord Roberts and the Quartermaster General, by which latter official it was reported to the Secretary of State for War; and will he say why this advice was ignored.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Will the honourable Member kindly give me the name of the Hungarian gentleman, and the dates of his interviews with the officers mentioned? I have received such a large number of suggestions that it is necessary to obtain the information I now ask from the hon. Member to trace the specific case to which he refers.

Remissions of Sentences for Military Offences.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: To ask the Secretary of State for War, if he will state what steps are being taken to reconsider the sentences of soldiers undergoing imprisonment in military prisons for military offences, having regard to the fact that a recent visit of the Commander in Chief to Dover Military Prison brought about the liberation of soldiers undergoing sentences in that prison.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The sentences of all military prisoners sent home from South Africa have been carefully reviewed from time to time, and considerable remissions granted in cases where they could be made with a due regard to the interests of discipline. In particular all sentences of penal servitude have been investigated, and in every case where possible have been commuted to a term of imprisonment so as to avoid the committal of the prisoners to civil prisons. Instructions were recently issued to General Officers Commanding, directing them to review the cases of all military prisoners from South Africa in the military prisons in their command, and to grant such remissions as they might consider desirable. As regards other military prisoners the remission of sentences is left to the discretion of confirming officers. If any sentence seems to the Judge Advocate General to be unnecessarily severe he brings the case to the notice of the Commander-in-Chief.

South Africa—Remount Farms—Court-martial on Captain Gordon Turner.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he is aware that at the court-martial on Captain Gordon Turner, assembled at Queenstown, South Africa, 7th April 1902, it was shown in evidence that remount farms at Clark's Siding, Cape Colony, had been leased to Government as containing 14,000 acres at a monthly rent of £10 per 1,000 acres, whereas the lessor only possessed 9,030 acres, thereby incurring a loss to the public of £50 per month; and whether he is aware that during those leases the lessor sold to Government for some time 600,000 lbs. of green forage daily, at £40 a day, grown on the leased farms; whether he will communicate to Parliament full particulars of these transactions, and the action taken by the military authorities to end this loss to the public and punish those responsible.

COLONEL WELBY: To ask the Secresary of State for War, if he can say by whom the remount farms at Clark's Siding were inspected previous to April, 1902; and whether the inspecting officer reported the loss Government was incurring to the Officer Commanding Eastern District, Cape Colony.

COLONEL WELBY: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether the General Officer Commanding Eastern District, Cape Colony, by sanctioning the leases of the remount farms at Clark's Siding, made himself responsible that the public interest was duly considered and safe-guarded in them.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The points raised in the three Questions on this subject require very careful consideration, and it has been necessary to refer the matters to the authorities in South Africa, the information at my disposal being incomplete. I am afraid, therefore, I shall not be able to give any reply for some time.

Motor Car Regulations.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the President of the Local Government Board, whether his attention has been called to the reports of the Chief Constables of Surrey and other counties as to the danger caused by the excessive speed at which motor cars are driven. And, whether he will obtain facilities for the early consideration of the Bill promoted by the Automobile Club and introduced by the hon. Member for the New Forest Division of Hants, providing for the identification of motor cars by a conspicuous number, and for the licensing of motor drivers, or adopt other measures for the safety of the public.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have seen a recent report of the Chief Constable of Surrey, and I am aware that complaints frequently have been made as to the danger caused by the excessive speed of motor cars. The latter part of the Question is really one for my right hon. friend the head of the Government, but I am afraid there is no probability that the Bill referred to could be proceeded with during the present Session.

Fiji—Proposed Federation with New Zealand.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in view of the fact that a short time ago a petition was presented to His Majesty the King, signed by several thousand Fijians, asking that their islands may be federated with New Zealand, if he will say what reply has been given to the petition; and will he lay the petition and reply on the Table of the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) No such petition has reached me.

Opium Importation into Ceylon.

MR. CAINE: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he is aware that the importation of opium into Ceylon last year was 21,005 lbs., in 1895 12,827 lbs., in 1880 10,116 lbs., while in 1870 it was only 2,499 lbs., thus increasing over eight-fold in thirty years; and whether he will order an inquiry into the causes of this increase, with a view to its abatement.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) The figures quoted appear to be correct, except for the year 1870, when the imports amounted to 12,449 lbs., and not 2,499 lbs. I will ask the Governor of Ceylon to make inquiry into the causes of any increase.

South Africa—War Contribution from the New Colonies.

MR. CLAUDE LOWTHER (Cumberland, Eskdale): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether His Majesty's Government have settled upon any specific sum as the amount of the indebtedness of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) I presume that the hon. Member refers to the contribution in aid of the cost of the war. If so, the answer is that no specific amount has yet been fixed by His Majesty's Government.

War Taxation of the Transvaal.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether it is intended that Transvaal mines, already existing and still to be opened up, shall be taxed on the same basis and be equally subject to the 10 per cent. tax on profits; whether it is intended to increase the tax on profits beyond the 10 per cent. rate now in force; whether the profits of this tax will be devoted to the ordinary expenditure of the colony, or partially or entirely devoted to meet the service of any loan issued in respect of the cost of the war; and whether he is in a position to indicate the course to be followed in regard to making the colony responsible for the cost of the war.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) I regret that I am not at present prepared to add anything to the statement made in this House on the 29th July, in which I laid down the general principles on which His Majesty's Government would proceed.†

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he is yet in a position to give any indication as to the date when he will be able to make an announcement in reference to the amount of the war expenditure which the Transvaal is to be called upon to bear.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) I regret that I am not yet in a position to make any statement on the subject.

Gibraltar Dock-Labourers' Strike—Military and Police Assistance to Employers.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he is aware that vessels trading in the interest of private owners have been unloaded at Government wharves in Gibraltar during the recent labour dispute there; that soldiers and police have, by the orders of the Governor, been employed in the unloading of such ships; and will he say if the employment of soldiers in such a manner is consistent with the regulations of the service, and has the approval of His Majesty's Government; and whether he is aware that Government vessels have been used to convey Moorish and other labourers to Gibraltar to replace the men locked out by the dock companies.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) No vessels were unloaded at the Government Wharves at Gibraltar during the recent labour disputes, nor were soldiers or police employed in connection with the unloading of vessels, except in cases where Government stores, or stores intended for important public works, had to be landed. His Majesty's Government are satisfied that the action of the Governor in this matter did not go beyond what was required for the protection of Government interests. The answer to the last part of the Question is in the negative.

Sierra Leone Government Steam Launch.

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether a yacht or steam launch was purchased by or for the Sierra Leone Government; and, if so, at what price, and for what object, and at what date.

(*Answered by Mr Secretary Chamberlain.*) A steam launch was constructed for the Sierra Leone Government by Messrs. J. S. White and Company, of Cowes, at a cost of £4,805. The launch is required for the general services of the colony in the place of the old colonial steamer, which has been condemned as unfit for further use, and it arrived in the colony on the 21st of March. The cost mentioned above is exclusive of the cost of the armament (one Hotchkiss 37 m.m. Q.F. gun and one rifle calibre Maxim gun), which amounted to £594 5s. 11d.

---

† See preceding volume, page 42.

Lagos Lifeboat.

MR. MOON: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether a lifeboat worth £3,000 was recently sent out to the Lagos Government, and, being condemned immediately on her arrival by the harbour master, now lies useless in the harbour.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) A lifeboat, of which the total cost, including freight to the Colony, was £2,256 9s. 6d., was sent out to Lagos early in 1900. No lifeboat has been sent out since then, and no complaints have been received with regard to the one sent out in 1900, but inquiry will be made.

Sekondi Pier.

MR. MOON: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, what has been the expense of constructing the pier at Sekondi; when it was finished; and whether there are any statistics showing the extent to which it has been used.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) The expense of constructing the pier at Sekondi was £26,887. The pier was finished in April, 1902. There are no statistics in the Colonial Office showing the extent to which it has been used.

Roumania—American Note on Treatment of Jews.

MAJOR EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether the correspondence upon the note of the American Government regarding the treatment of the Jews in Roumania will be published, and whether the House will be given an opportunity of discussing the question.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The correspondence upon the note of the United States Government to which my honourable friend refers is not complete, and I am not therefore in a position to answer the concluding part of the question.

Sugar Convention.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the stipulation in the Sugar Convention that it shall be ratified on the 1st February, 1903, he proposes, during the present session, to ask the sanction of Parliament to that Convention.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) Effect cannot be given to the provisions of the Sugar Convention without an Act of Parliament. The Convention, however, does not come into force until 1st September, 1903, although it has to be ratified by the 1st February next. The Government propose to ask for the sanction of Parliament by way of Resolution, which will enable them to ratify it before the latter date, 1st February.

Sentences on Members—Communications to the Speaker.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether he proposes to take any action to vindicate the right of the House to receive immediate reports of the withdrawal by a sentence of a Court of Law of any Member from the service of the House.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The practice is for a communication to be made to the Speaker when the Member is committed to prison, bail not being allowed. I understand that there has in fact been no infraction of this custom.

Board of Education—President's Salary.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether he can say how it is proposed to provide for the salary, during the current financial year, of the President of the Board of Education, who was appointed to that office on the 11th of August last.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The salary will be charged against the Education Vote. If this be insufficient a Supplementary Estimate will be presented towards the close of the financial year.

Honours—Ministers and the Royal Prerogative.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether the Royal Prerogative of conferring orders and honorific distinctions is exercised by His Majesty upon the advice of His Majesty's Ministers, or otherwise.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I trust that my hon. friend will not think it necessary to deal by way of Question with the subject of Prerogative.

Bestowal of the Garter on Sovereigns not of Christian Faith.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury, can he state, or will he agree to a Return stating, the number of foreign Sovereigns on whom the Order of the Garter has been conferred since the year 1837, and the number of those Sovereigns who were not of Christian faith.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) There is, I believe, no objection to such a Return, though perhaps my hon. friend will be content with the statement that only three names would appear in such a Return of Sovereigns not of the Christian faith, namely, the Sultans of Turkey, Abdul Medjid and Abdul Aziz, and the late Shah of Persia.

Greenwich Hospital and Patriotic Funds.

Mr. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is able to announce any decision which may have been reached with regard to relieving the Greenwich Hospital Funds in respect of pensions to widows of seamen killed on duty; and, whether he is prepared to consider the possibility of devoting a portion at least of the Patriotic Fund to this purpose.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am afraid I am not yet in a position to announce any decision in this matter, but I hope before long to be able to do so.

New Procedure Rules—"Order in Debate."

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Spalding): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the condition in which the new Rule of Procedure relating to Order in Debate is left by the Government at present, and having regard to the occurrences of Thursday last and their possible recurrence, he proposes to take steps, and, if so, when, to give effect to the intention expressed by himself to complete that Rule before the close of the session.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I have not absolutely given up the hope that the House may be able to deal with the Order referred to by my right hon. friend in the course of the present Session, but the arrangements for proceeding with it must necessarily depend upon the progress made with public business.

Royal Progress on 25th October—Bank Holiday Proclamation.

Sir SEYMOUR KING: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether it is proposed to declare 25th October a Bank Holiday, at least so far as London is concerned.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) Yes, so far as London is concerned, there will be a Bank Holiday on Saturday next. It is correctly stated in a public announcement today that the proclamation is solely intended for the necessities of bankers' business arising out of the probable congestion in the streets along the route of the Royal progress, and will not affect the shopkeeping community at large nor enjoin a general suspension of employment.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

The Operations in Somaliland.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Have the Government any further information as to events in Somaliland?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord Cranborne, Rochester): I have very little to communicate to the House beyond what appeared in the newspapers this morning, sent by the Foreign Office. I think I ought to begin by saying on behalf of the Secretary of State how deeply he regrets the lamentable loss of life that has taken place, and the possible results of the retirement which has followed. We have every confidence in Colonel Swayne, who is a very experienced officer in those regions, but, of course, Colonel Swayne is at the front, and he cannot be responsible for sending forward reinforcements. Fortunately, in the ordinary course of his duties, General Manning, who is the principal military adviser in the Foreign Office Protectorates, arrived at Aden yesterday morning, and we have placed at his disposal, after communicating with the India Office, an Indian battalion, and also have ordered from Central Africa the reserve battalion of the Protectorate's own forces. We have informed him that if he does not consider this force sufficient we shall be quite ready to supply other troops. The House ought to remember, in considering these events, that the country over which these operations had to take place is exceedingly difficult. Not only is the actual battlefield apparently covered with very thick bush, but, in order to get there, a large extent of perfectly barren and waterless country had to be crossed, throwing great difficulties in the way of forces advancing in such a country. In these circumstances it is not surprising that after so severe an action Colonel Swayne thought it better to retire. But we do not conceal from ourselves the fact that that may necessitate very much more prolonged operations than we had hoped, and a larger force than we had at first thought would be sufficient. That is all I have to tell the House at present.

MR. LLEWELLYN (Somerset, N.): Has the noble Lord any further information with regard to casualties?

LORD CRANBORNE: Not beyond what has been published.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is the War Office or the Foreign Office responsible for the conduct of the campaign?

LORD CRANBORNE: The Foreign Office.

H.M.S. "Terrible"—Design of Gun-carriage used at Ladysmith.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, what was the date of H.M.S. "Terrible's" leaving Hong Kong, and the number of days occupied by her voyage to Portsmouth; what was the amount of coal she consumed on the voyage; and if she can now steam her designed speed of 22 knots; and if he will state who designed the gun-carriage for the guns used at Ladysmith.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The "Terrible" left Hong Kong on 29th July, and arrived at Portsmouth on 18th September, occupying fifty-one days on the voyage, of which thirty-four were steaming days, the remaining seventeen being spent in harbour. The amount of coal consumed on the voyage was 8,670 tons, of which 7,466 tons were consumed when under way. On her last full-speed trial, in July, 1901, she developed 24·693 horse-power for four hours. No full-speed trial has been made since that date. It is doubtful whether the ship can now maintain her designed speed for any length of time, as her boilers, engines, and auxiliary machinery require extensive repairs, such as may be expected at the close of a long commission. The gun-carriages for the guns used at Ladysmith were designed by Captain Percy Scott, and were constructed under his immediate supervision.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: May I ask the hon. Gentleman if he is aware that the gun-carriage was designed by Assistant Engineer Roscoe, and not by Captain Percy Scott?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am not aware of that fact, and I am clear that the facts are as I have stated them.

Military Service in India.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, whether the correspondence which commenced with the telegram of the 26th February to the Government of India as to the conditions of service of British troops in India is complete, and when the Papers showing the views of the Government of India will be laid before Parliament.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): There has been some delay in completing this correspondence, but I expect in a short time to get the final views of the Government of India; until I receive their despatch I cannot reply as to what Papers will be laid before Parliament. As the War Office and India Office were unable to agree as to what the relative apportionment of increased charge arising out of the change of the conditions of service should be, the matter will be referred to arbitration.

Indian Imperial Council.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, whether he will give the names of the present members of the Indian Imperial Council established at the New Year of 1877 by Lord Lytton, under the Command of the late Queen-Empress; and whether, looking to the desire then proclaimed of obtaining in matters of importance the counsel and advice of the Princes and Chiefs of India, and of associating them with the Paramount Power in a manner honourable to themselves and advantageous to the Empire, he will state whether at the Delhi Coronation Durbar occasion will be taken to hold a session of the Council, and thus further the objects of the institution.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The Council of the Empire at present consists solely of *ex officio* members, and there is no intention of holding a session at Delhi on the occasion of the Coronation Durbar.

MR. CAINE: Is it worth while continuing this Council in existence? It has not met for many years.

(No answer was given.)

Assam Tea Gardens—German Liquor Shops.

MR. CAINE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, if his attention has been called to the memorandum submitted to the Chief Commissioner of Assam by the Hon. James Buckingham, C.I.E., lately a member of the Vice-Regal Council of India, on the crime and disorder produced among coolies in the Assam tea gardens by the excessive number of liquor shops established by the Government throughout the tea area of that State; and if he has observed the statement of the Chief Commissioner in Clause 3 of his resolution on the Excise Report of 1901–2, to the effect that, although the policy of the administration in regard to the sale of liquor has been repeatedly inquired into during the past twenty years, a fresh investigation will now be opened; will he state what is the nature of this promised investigation, is it now in progress, and will he lay upon the Table of the House a copy of Mr. Buckingham's memorandum, the correspondence which has taken place between the Chief Commissioner of Assam and the Deputy Commissioner of Labour Districts in Assam, particulars of the inquiries into the administration in regard to the sale of liquor referred to in the Chief Commissioner's resolution, and a statement of the nature of the promised fresh investigation?

*LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I understand that the memorandum in question has engaged the attention of the local administration which has undertaken to make a fresh inquiry into the excise arrangement of the Province. I am in communication with the Viceroy on the subject, and when I receive the information I have asked for, I will consider what papers can be presented.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): Will the Question be considered whether the Government ought to be interested in the drink traffic in India?

(No answer was returned.)

Savings Bank Funds.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, and, if so, when, it is proposed to take steps to carry out the report and recommendations of the Select Committee on Savings Banks Funds, including certain administrative reforms; and if it is intended to reduce the interest payable to the banks by one-eighth per cent., from what date such reduction is likely to take place, and whether notice will be given to the banks and to the public.

*The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Ritchie, Croydon): I have a Bill prepared to carry out the recommendations of the Select Committee, reducing the interest from 20th May next in the case of the Trustee Banks, and from 1st July next in the case of the Post Office Banks, and I think it will perhaps be advisable to introduce it in the hope that it may pass unopposed. Otherwise it must be re-introduced early next session with a view to passing it by the dates named, in which case the notice to depositors will be much shorter. Further postponement of the reduction in the rate of interest would involve a heavy charge on the taxpayers.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of making the date uniform in the case of each class of banks? It is important there should be notice to depositors.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.); And, if there is opposition, will the right hon. Gentleman undertake to give reasonable facilities for the consideration of this important matter?

*Mr. RITCHIE: I do not think that, with the business at present before the House, we can possibly hope to get through a Bill of this kind if it has really contentious matter in it.

Mr. LOUGH: There will be.

*Mr. RITCHIE: But it must be introduced early next session. As to the Question of my hon. friend, the financial year is different in the case of each class of banks, and, in order to make the date uniform, they would have to change their financial year. That would be attended with some difficulty, and I do not want to add anything more to the work we have to do in connection with the matter.

Agreements with Cunard Company and Atlantic Shipping Trust.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether His Majesty's Government propose to lay upon the Table of this House the terms of the agreements come to respectively with the Cunard Company as to their ships, and with Mr. Pierpont Morgan as to the ships acquired by the American Corporation known as the Atlantic Shipping Trust; and, if so, when; whether, during the present session, any opportunity will be afforded to this House of discussing those agreements; and on what date the first payments to be made by His Majesty's Government under either of these agreements will become due.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): The Government propose to lay upon the Table of the House the formal agreements with the Cunard Steamship Company and the Atlantic Shipping Trust when these have been duly executed. My right hon friend the Prime Minister informs me that he will be prepared to find some evening for a discussion of the subject, if desired, after the agreements have been laid. It is unlikely that any payment under the agreement with the Cunard Steamship Company will fall due during the present financial year. The agreement with the Atlantic Shipping Trust does not involve any additional burden on the Exchequer.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentleman be good enough to give an indication as to when the Papers are likely to be laid on the Table of the House?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I cannot name a date, but I hope it will not be very long.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): We are told it is to involve no financial burden on the Exchequer. But at what rate of interest is the money to be advanced?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: No money is to be advanced to the Atlantic Shipping Trust.

Argentine Cattle Trade—Remount Supplies.

Mr. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, in view of the late rise in the prices of meat, negotiations have yet been conducted and carried to a favourable issue with the Government of the Argentine Republic for the admission of live cattle for slaughter at certain ports in this country, due precautions having been taken before embarkation to inquire into the healthy condition of the cattle; and will he say when such admission will be allowed.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Before my right hon. friend answers that Question may I ask him whether his attention has been drawn to the following paragraph in the Report of the Committee of Inquiry upon the question of remounts:—

> "They (the horses) were all subject to final approval in Buenos Ayres, where they were collected in large cattle pens which had been erected for the storing of cattle, but which were then vacant owing to the existence of the foot-and-mouth disease."

And whether, under those circumstances, the admission of live cattle from Argentina for slaughter might not inflict incalculable mischief on this country.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The negotiations referred to in the Question are not yet concluded. Admission will be allowed when the Argentine regulations are such as to afford adequate security against the admission of diseased animals into this country. The hon. Member is, I presume, aware that both this year and last we have received more meat from the Argentine than ever previously—and that the first nine months of this year especially show a very large excess above the record of any previous nine months. At the present rate the imports of meat from the Argentine this year should be about 20 per cent. more than in 1899, the year before the ports were closed to live cattle.

MR. SCHWANN: But is it not the fact that the total imports of meat into the United Kingdom during last year show a considerable reduction?

MR. HANBURY: That may be true, but the fact that there has been a drought in Australia and a shortage of maize in the United States is no argument for doing that which would involve the risk of importing disease into this country from the Argentine.

MR. CHAPLIN: Will my right hon. friend give the House an opportunity of discussing this question of the restrictions on the importation of cattle from Argentina before they are removed?

MR. HANBURY: That is a Question which must be put to my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury.

Limerick Postmastership.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that there is a vacancy for postmaster at Limerick; and whether, seeing that five-sixths of the population of the city are Roman Catholics, and that all local superior appointments, with one exception, are held by Protestants, and that no Roman Catholic has filled the position for the past thirty-five years, he will now consider the advisability of selecting an Irishman and a Roman Catholic for the post.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The vacancy has been notified in the usual manner in the Post Office Circular, and in due course I shall appoint the candidate who, in my opinion, is best qualified for the post without inquiring as to his nationality or religious belief.

Monasterevan (Ireland) Railway Accident.

MR. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether his attention has been called to an accident which occurred at Monasterevan, Great Southern and Western Railway, Ireland, on the 11th of November last year, when the line gave way under the 10.5 p.m. train from Kingsbridge to Cork, causing a milk truck and the guard's van to roll down the embankment, injuring the guard; and, if so, will he state the cause of the line giving way and the date the Company reported such accident to the Board of Trade.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir. My attention has been called to the accident referred to. It would appear from the Railway Company's explanations that relaying operations had been in progress at the place in question, and from some cause which has not been ascertained the rear portion of a goods train was derailed. The Company's officers were unable to agree as to the cause of the accident, and as the occurrence was not reported to the Board of Trade until the 21st August last, the Department had not an opportunity of ordering an inquiry at a time when a formal investigation would have been of service. The Company have explained that the delay in reporting the accident was due to an oversight, which they regret, and they state that steps have been taken to ensure that any future accidents shall be promptly reported to the Board.

Cork Steamship Service—Subsidy to Clyde Shipping Company.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether his attention has been called to the fact that a subsidy of £500 has again been granted by the Congested Districts Board to the Clyde Shipping Company for running a steamer from Cork to the south-western seaboard of Ireland; and whether, seeing that the Limerick Harbour Board and Chamber of Commerce have protested strongly against this grant in view of a similar subsidy having been refused to Limerick, which is a competing port, he will say what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Representations in favour of a continuance of the subsidy were received from the Kerry County Council, the Cork Chamber of Commerce, and from a number of other local bodies and leading traders. The Board has approved of payment of the subsidy, as a tentative measure, for a further period of one year.

Convictions of Nationalist Members—Communications to the Speaker.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state how many Members of the House of Commons have been arrested under the provisions of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, on the warrants of resident magistrates, and sentenced to imprisonment by resident magistrates in the interval between the adjournment of the House of Commons on 8th August and the present time; and whether he can state the names of the Gentlemen so arrested and sentenced and the terms of their imprisonment; and whether he has any, and, if so, what explanation to give of the neglect in any case of the resident magistrates to communicate to the Speaker of the House of Commons the fact of the arrest and commitment by them of Members of this House.

MR. WYNDHAM: Three hon. Members—for the Birr Division of King's County, for South Mayo, and for East Galway—having failed to appear in answer to summonses, were arrested on the warrants of resident magistrates and sentenced to two months with hard labour, three months with hard labour, and four months with hard labour respectively. On appeal, the sentence on the first hon. Member was confirmed, but the hard labour was remitted. In the other two cases appeals are pending. No other hon. Members have been arrested, but the hon. Member for the Tullamore Division of King's County was sentenced to two months with hard labour. This sentence has been reduced on appeal to one month without hard labour. Two hon. Members, therefore—for the Birr Division and the Tullamore Division—are debarred from attending this House. Two others—for South Mayo and East Galway—having been arrested on warrants, are at liberty pending appeal. In reply to the second part of the Question, communications, whether from resident magistrates or County Court judges, are addressed directly to Mr. Speaker, and not through the Irish Government. I understand that Mr. Speaker received a communication in respect of the two hon. Members who are debarred from attending the House, but that no communication reached him in respect to the hon. Members for South Mayo and East Galway, who are not so debarred. [Laughter.]

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: This is no laughing matter.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): And you will soon learn that.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I want to ask whether the resident magistrates have, in any case whatever, sent letters to Mr. Speaker which have been suppressed in Dublin Castle by the right hon. Gentleman's orders.

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir, I do not think the hon. Member listened to my answer. I said that all these communications go direct to Mr. Speaker, and not to the Irish Office.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Now, I will ask another Question. I want to know this—whether it was not at the instance of the Executive Government that the resident magistrates failed to comply with the ordinary courtesies to this House, and whether it is not in accordance with precedent that, immediately a warrant is issued against a Member of this House and he is arrested, a communication should be addressed to Mr. Speaker, and why that was not done in this case.

MR. WYNDHAM: I will not go into the question of precedent, but I will say that no action was taken, and no action was left undone, at the instance of the Executive Government.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Has the right hon. Gentleman read the whole sentence in each case? Is it not the fact that each hon. Member was, in addition, required to go to prison for three months in lieu of giving bail, on the expiration of each sentence, for his future good behaviour?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have endeavoured to answer the Question on the Paper. [Nationalist cries of "You have not."] It is impossible to give all the details. I have answered the Question on the Paper. [Nationalist cries of "You have not."] I have endeavoured to give all the information that is material. The hon. Member is quite right in stating that certainly in one case, in the case of the hon. Member for South Mayo, it is present to my mind that he was called upon to give bail, and I dare say in some of the other cases.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): These are what the right hon. Gentleman calls matters of detail! Is it not the fact that the sentences actually imposed on these men are just double what the right hon. Gentleman has stated to the House?

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Isle of Thanet): Are we to understand that there has been any failure on the part of any judicial officer in Ireland to perform the immemorial practice of acquainting you, Sir, officially with the sentence passed?

*MR. SPEAKER: Upon the facts stated by the right hon. Gentleman, I do not understand that there has been any failure. Four cases have been referred to; in two of them the hon. Members in question were committed to prison, and in those cases notices have been given. The other two were cases in which there was an arrest of two hon. Members in order that they might answer to a charge which they were summoned to answer; when those cases came before the magistrates, I think I am right in saying they were convicted, but were let out on bail during an appeal. In such a case the duty of the magistrate does not arise. It is laid down in "May's Parliamentary Practice"—and I think correctly laid down—that the duty of the magistrate arises when he has committed a criminal to prison and when he is detained there without bail. In all the cases in which the duty arose it seems to me to have been complied with. As far as I am competent to judge, it has also been complied with in the case of the hon. Member for North Leitrim, who was convicted on Thursday. I have read this afternoon to the House a letter from the resident magistrate stating his conviction and sentence.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: In Mr. M'Hugh's case he has appealed, and he is at liberty. I wish to bring under your notice the fact that one of the resident magistrates, whose name I heard you, Sir, read out, a Mr. Brown, presided in two Courts in which Members of this House have been convicted; they appealed, but he did not communicate with you. If he has communicated with you now, what is the meaning of this variance?

*MR. SPEAKER: The facts are as I stated them, as far as I am aware, and they seem to me to be in accordance with the ordinary rule.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Is it not a fact that King's County is at present deprived of all representation in this House?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the Question. The Question on the Paper has been fully answered. If hon. Members desire to ask other Questions on this matter, they must put them down on the Paper.

MR. LOGAN (Leicestershire, Harboro): I wish to ask—

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I have said that the Question has been fully answered.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Permit me—

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! If any hon. Member wishes to ask a further Question he must put it down in the ordinary way.

*MR. DELANY (Queen's Co., Ossory): On a point of order, I wish to ask whether you, Sir, are aware that the hon. Member for the Birr Division was in prison under arrest, pending his trial on a warrant for non-appearance, for nine days in Tullamore Jail.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not know how the fact was; I will assume that the hon. Member is quite correct, but that does not affect what I have stated.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: But if that is so, ought not you to have been informed?

*MR. SPEAKER: I have already stated what I conceive to be the duty laid down for magistrates under the practice of this House. I cannot allow it to be argued.

MR. MACVEAGH: It will be argued, anyhow. I wish to ask whether Mr. Speaker is aware that the hon. Member for East Galway will be committed to prison tomorrow, and that Questions put down on the Paper now cannot be asked before the hon. Member is committed.

*MR. SPEAKER: That certainly does not arise out of this Question.

Convictions under the Crimes Act.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state how many persons were sentenced to terms of imprisonment with hard labour under The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, since its enactment in July, 1887, and the suspension of its operation in Ireland under the provisions of the Statute in 1892; and how many persons have been sentenced to terms of imprisonment with hard labour since the Proclamation of April, 1902, placing certain counties of Ireland under the operation of this Act, and the present time.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number in the first-mentioned period was 1,601. The number since April last is forty-eight; this latter number includes cases in which sentences have been varied on appeal, and also cases in which appeals are now pending.

Sergeant Sullivan, Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain why a constable of the Royal Irish Constabulary, who was one of the accomplices of ex-Sergeant Sheridan of that force in the perpetration of crime and the conviction by perjured evidence of innocent persons for the crime so perpetrated, is still a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. WYNDHAM: One constable admitted at the Inquiry that the chief part of his evidence was not true of his own knowledge, but urged that he believed it to be true, because Sergeant Sheridan told him so. Sheridan's other accomplices resigned, but this constable refused to do so, and has been stationed at the depôt since August, 1901.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: And is this man to remain in the pay of the Crown while Irish Members are put on a plank bed?

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): Will the right hon. Gentleman give the name of the case in which this constable gave admittedly false evidence?

MR. WYNDHAM: The course pursued by the Government in this matter was explained by me so recently as on the 23rd July last.† I must refer the hon. and learned Member to the statement made by me on that occasion.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: But this is a question which can be immediately answered. There were three or four cases in which Sheridan committed perjury, and I want to know the particular case in which this constable who is retained in the force did so.

MR. WYNDHAM: I can only refer the hon. Member to my previous statement. To that I adhere.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: And is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this constable is at the depôt giving instruction to new entrants into the force.?

Nationalist Members Imprisoned for Speeches.

MR. LEAMY (Kildare, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, how many Members of this House representing Irish constituencies have been sentenced to terms of imprisonment in Ireland during the past twelve months on charges based upon political speeches made by them; how many of them have been sentenced to hard labour; and will he say if such sentence involves sleeping on a plank bed and a dietary for several days of bread and water.

MR. WYNDHAM: Exclusive of the case of the hon. Member for East Clare, who has been ordered by the King's Bench Division to give sureties for good behaviour or to go to prison in default, seven Members were convicted and sentenced to imprisonment during the past twelve months. One was convicted on three different occasions, and one on two occasions. Appeals were lodged against seven convictions; in four cases the convictions were confirmed, and in three the appeals are pending. Another conviction came before the Superior Court on a case stated, which was dismissed. Four Members were sentenced to hard labour; on appeal, this was removed in two cases. A sentence of hard labour involves sleeping on a plank bed, without a mattress, for the first fourteen days of sentence, unless the Medical Officer shall otherwise order.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: What about the raiders?

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: What about Jameson? [Nationalist cheers and disorder.]

MR. WYNDHAM (continuing): The Irish Prison Rules, like those in operation in England, prescribe that every prisoner shall be supplied with "a sufficient quantity of wholesome food, according to a scale or scales of diet." If the hon. Member will refer to these Rules, which have been laid on the Table of the House, he will find that a sentence of hard labour does not entail a dietary of bread and water.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether there has been any case before of proceedings under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act of 1887 where sentences of hard labour were imposed?

MR. WYNDHAM: In reply to a previous Question, I stated that there were 1,601. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: That was the total convictions.]

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Cases with hard labour?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir; 1,601 cases where the sentence imposed by the Court of First Instance entailed hard labour.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Utterly wrong.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Do you mean that under the administration of the Prime Minister in Ireland there were 1,601 cases of hard labour?

---

†See (4) *Debates*, cxi., 1072, *et seq.*

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Under me, and subsequently.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: 1,601 cases of hard labour?

MR. WYNDHAM: That is so.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: I mean, of course, for offences under the Criminal Law Procedure Amendment Act (Ireland), 1887?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir.

MR. LOGAN: I desire to ask whether I am right in supposing that a sentence which carries with it hard labour also carries disqualification to sit as a county or district councillor.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the Question. The Question has been fully answered.

MR. DEVLIN (Belfast S.): I would ask, Sir——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Closure him; he has only spoken once, like O'Donnell.

MR. DEVLIN again rose.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! There must be some end to these supplementary Questions.

MR. DEVLIN once more rose.

*MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member rise on a point of order?

MR. DEVLIN: Yes, Sir. I want to know whether hard labour was inflicted on Mr. O'Brien when he was convicted.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I must ask the hon. Member to conform to the rules of the House. Rightly or wrongly, the Speaker has to be the judge in these matters, and I have given my decision.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND rose to put a further Question.

*MR SPEAKER: The hon. Member has been long in the House, and he must know that business cannot be properly conducted if Members persist in putting these supplementary Questions.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I have no desire whatever to unduly prolong Questions, but am I not entitled to ask a Question arising out of a reply of the right hon. Gentleman as to the accuracy of one of the statements he made?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member should put down his Question. The Question on the Paper has been fully answered.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Then I beg to give notice that I will put down a Question.

MR. MACVEAGH: Are you aware that the Clerks at the Table have repeatedly ruled that they cannot allow a Question bearing upon a Question which has already been answered?

*MR. SPEAKER: The rulings are given by me, and not by the Clerks at the Table. A Question may be put to elicit a particular fact without referring to an answer previously given.

MR. MACVEAGH: Mine has been rejected for that reason.

Judge Curran and the Mullingar Grand Jury.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, has he observed that at the Mullingar Quarter Sessions, in the proclaimed county of Westmeath, there was no criminal case for trial except a charge of burglary against a soldier, and that the Grand Jury unanimously passed a resolution respectfully requesting the Government to remove the proclamation of the county on account of its peaceful and crimeless condition; whether he is aware that County Court Judge Curran, who presided, tore up the resolution and threw the pieces of paper towards the Grand Jury, and, when one of the Grand Jury asked to be informed of any case of boycotting in the county, the judge threatened him with imprisonment; and seeing that Grand Juries in Ireland have habitually passed resolutions dealing with the state of the country which have been received by the judges, will the Government take any steps to secure the freedom of speech of Grand Juries, when respectfully representing to the Government the crimelessness of proclaimed districts.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have seen a newspaper account of the proceedings in question. The learned judge is reported to have congratulated the Grand Jury on the freedom of the district from ordinary crime. He expressed regret, however, at the introduction of the "thin edge of boycotting," and referred, from his lengthened experience, to the serious result of the system. To what extent the newspaper report is an accurate record of what took place I cannot say. The Government has no responsibility in the matter mentioned in the concluding part of the Question.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: May I ask whether the Chief Secretary has given us an official communication from the county-court judge; and whether it is not a fact that all the newspapers reported that after tearing up the resolution and throwing it at the Grand Jury the judge said, "There's your precious resolution"? Will the right hon. Gentleman inform Judge Curran that if on a question of local knowledge twenty-three Grand Jurymen living in the neighbourhood——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! This is really making a speech on the Question.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I think you might allow me to finish my Question. When I have put it I will bow at once to your ruling. What I desire to ask is whether, if a difference of opinion arises on a local matter between the judge and the jury, the Chief Secretary will inform the judge that the difference of opinion ought not to be treated as a crime for which Grand Jurors are to be committed to prison?

Mr. WYNDHAM: No, Sir; I never make communications to judges.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: It is very hard to put a Question amid the bursts of laughter of the hon. Members opposite who do not know what imprisonment is.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Some of them do.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Yes. Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this Judge Curran is to try Mr. O'Donnell's appeal?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the Question.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: In reference to the last reply of the Chief Secretary, might I ask the Prime Minister whether, now that the County Courts in Ireland form a portion of the exceptional tribunals——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member cannot ask a Question of the Prime Minister now.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Why not? I have asked them hundreds of times.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Because the Question on the Paper is disposed of, and the proper order is to take the next Question.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Well, but Mr. Speaker, this is a Question entirely and directly arising out of the answer of the Chief Secretary.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member's Question was addressed to a different Minister altogether, and he cannot interpolate Questions to any Minister.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Then I shall put the Question to the Chief Secretary himself. I beg to ask him whether, having regard to his answer that it is not possible for him at present to address any communications to county court judges in reference to any controversial questions, he will not recommend that the salaries of those judges should be taken off the Consolidated Fund, so that it may be possible for us to criticise their action?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the Question.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): May I ask the Chief Secretary why Judge Curran was removed——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order. That does not arise out of the Question.

Mr. MURPHY: Will you allow me to complete it?

*Mr. SPEAKER: No, I will not.

An Hon. Member: Because he is an Irishman.

Mr. MURPHY: Then I will put it down.

Mr. DELANY: Do not the criminal statistics for the last three months show—

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the Question.

Mr. DELANY: Show there is no crime——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Sergeant Sullivan, Royal Irish Constabulary—Position of Mr. T. P. Nolan.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the evidence of Thomas Patrick Nolan, expert in handwriting, an official of the Local Government Board, on the hearing of the prosecution against the editor, manager, and printer of the *Irish People* newspaper, that he agreed with Mr. Gurrin, the Treasury expert, that the forged letter, purporting to come from Mr. John MacHale, president of the West Mayo United Irish League, arranging for a murderous outrage, was in the handwriting of Sergeant Sullivan, Royal Irish Constabulary, of Mulranny; whether he is aware that Nolan further avowed that, notwithstanding his own conclusion, he was employed by Sergeant Sullivan at the Sligo and Dublin trials to discredit the evidence of Mr. Gurrin and so shield Sergeant Sullivan from justice; and will he say whether Sergeant Sullivan has been called upon for any explanation; has he been dismissed from the force; and whether any steps will be taken to prosecute him for perjury.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Chief Crown Solicitor reports that on the occasion mentioned Mr. Nolan, in answer to questions put to him on cross-examination, stated that in the Sullivan case three or four experts had not come to an opposite conclusion to his, and further that, as far as he was aware, Mr. Gurrin had not come to an opposite conclusion to his. These are the only avowals made by Mr. Nolan. There is no foundation, so far as I know, for the other statements concerning him contained in the Question. Sergeant Sullivan was tried and acquitted on the charge of writing a certain letter. He cannot, of course, be prosecuted on the same charge, nor would it be right to speculate on the possible effect which another expert witness might have produced on the minds of a jury who acquitted a man in opposition to evidence of the experts who were examined as witnesses against him.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Will any special steps be taken to prevent this man committing further acts of perjury —I respectfully press for an answer.

Mr. WYNDHAM. The hon. Member must know—

Nationalist cries: No, no!

Mr. WYNDHAM resumed his seat.

Imprisonment of Mr. O'Flanagan, J.P.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, if Mr. O'Flanagan, J.P., Chairman of the District Council of Cordfin, was recently sentenced to four months imprisonment with hard labour under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, and if he will state what was the character of his punishment; whether he had to sleep on a plank bed; whether he had for any time, and, if so, for how long a time, to subsist on bread and water; and if he has become insane, and has had to be transferred to a lunatic asylum.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The following report has been made by the Governor of Limerick Prison through the General Prisons Board—

"Mr. Flanagan was committed to this prison from Corofin Petty Sessions on 17th June last for four calendar months' hard labour under the Act referred to. He slept on a plank for the two nights succeeding his commitment to prison, after which he was given a full bed on the recommendation of the medical officer. He was not subjected to any punishment, and at no time did he get or subsist on bread and water. His employment for the first month of his sentence was chopping wood for manufacture into firewood, and during the remainder of his time he was engaged at carpentry work. On the 12th September, having complained of being unwell, he was placed under medical treatment, and on the 13th was removed to the prison hospital. On the 14th September, typhoid having developed, the medical officer recommended his discharge from prison, and he was accordingly released on the 15th September, by order of the Lords Justices, and removed to the County Limerick Infirmary under the supervision of the medical officer, who is physician to the Infirmary. He remained there under treatment, in the meantime, but having lately become insane he was on the 11th instant committed from the Infirmary to the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum. During the thirteen weeks he had been in custody at this prison he made no complaint as to his treatment. When he had been only three weeks in prison he got a pint of new milk extra, daily, which was continued up to the time of his removal to hospital and since the 8th August he had been getting C. Diet instead of B. diet."

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I hold the hon. Gentleman responsible for this man's condition.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Will a sworn inquiry be held into this case?

MR. WYNDHAM: I must ask for notice of that.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! It is now five minutes to three, and Questions must stop, except those relating to business and matters of urgent public importance.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I propose to take the Education Bill continuously at each afternoon sitting in the course of this week and on Friday, and to put down the London Water Bill as second Order. At the evening sitting to-day I propose to take the Second Reading of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, consideration of the Patent Law Amendment Bill, and the Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament) Bill, Second Reading. The same Bills will be proceeded with to-morrow, but I am afraid I cannot answer at present as to the evening sittings on Wednesday or Thursday.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It would perhaps meet the desires of a good many Members, in the present somewhat fluid condition of the Rules, if I ask what becomes of the remaining Questions which have not been put to-day, and whether they will come on at a definite time or drop altogether.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The answers will be printed and circulated with the Votes tomorrow.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Could we not now have an answer to a Question in the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose Burghs.

*MR. SPEAKER: No; all the Questions that have not been answered will be answered in the Votes tomorrow.

IRISH AFFAIRS—NATIONALIST DEMAND FOR A GENERAL DISCUSSION.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to ask him whether he has reconsidered the demand of the Irish Members for an opportunity of discussing the state of affairs in Ireland.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps it will be better if I make the matter perfectly clear, though it was my intention to do so before. The position, as I understand, with regard to a discussion upon Irish affairs, is this. There was a long and important debate upon the proclamation under the Crimes Act last session. There was, subsequent to that, another long and important debate upon the condition of Ireland on Irish Supply. That took place, I think, in July. Had it not been for the circumstance to which we owe this meeting at the present time, the opportunity which hon. Gentlemen desire could not have occurred. I think I stated on Thursday that it is in conformity with the invariable practice of the House that we cannot break into the ordinary procedure, except on the demand of the Opposition as a whole. [NATIONALIST cries of "Who are the Opposition?"] That is perfectly well understood. But, quite outside and beyond that well known safety valve for criticism upon the administration, there is, of course, that supplied by the power which hon. Gentlemen have, if they get the necessary support, of moving the adjournment. I do hope the hon. Gentleman will think that not an insufficient nor a wholly unsympathetic reply to his Question.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Speaking for my colleagues, I say we consider the answer most unsatisfactory.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: As the right hon. Gentleman has referred to-day and on a previous day to the action which may be taken by the Opposition as a whole, I would venture to submit to him that that reference to my friends and myself is hardly so much in accordance as he thinks with established practice. I pass by the point, which is very important, that when the Crimes Act was made permanent there was a distinct promise given—I think by the right hon. Gentleman himself in another capacity than that which he now occupies—that the House, on any important action being taken under the new law, should have an opportunity of being informed of the whole subject. But, leaving that on one side, I submit to the right hon. Gentleman that here we have a purely Irish question, and any of us can see by reading the newspapers and by the events that are passing under our observation every day, what reason there is for the representatives of Ireland to challenge, if they choose, the administration of affairs, and elicit from the Government a statement of the grounds upon which they are proceeding. The question is an Irish one, and this is a demand made by the constitutional representatives of Ireland. I should have thought that demand, in the circumstances, could not be refused. I cannot imagine, for instance, such a series of events occurring in Scotland and Scottish Members making such a demand and its being refused. I cordially and sincerely join with the Irish Members in supporting the demand for an opportunity of discussing the question, and I would beg the right hon. Gentleman to observe that it is to the constitutional demand of the Irish representatives that I think he owes it, and not to any instance or desire on the part of my friends here.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I must frankly say that I cannot accept the doctrine laid down by the right hon. Gentleman, which seems to me to be of a wholly Separatist kind. He seems to think that the misgovernment of Ireland, if it be misgovernment, or good government, is a purely Irish question. I do not admit that for a moment. The right hon. Gentleman says he supports the demand of the Irish Members. If, by supporting their demand, he means that he joins, as Leader of the Opposition, in making it, that demand will be at once granted, but I think there was a certain ambiguity in the phraseology of the right hon. Gentleman, which, perhaps, he will clear up.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have said that I entirely support the demand of the Irish Members, but that I consider it should be their demand and not mine.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I think I am entitled to ask the right hon. Gentleman what state of mind he is now in, what answer he has to give to the Question which I put?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is a perfectly clear and definite meaning attached to the process I described. The hon. Gentleman asks what state of mind I am in now. I am in rather a confused state of mind as to the position taken up by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. As soon as that is cleared up I will give the hon. Gentleman an answer.

SERGEANT SULLIVAN, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the conduct of the Government in Ireland in reference to the charges of forgery, manufacture of outrage and perjury against Sergeant Sullivan of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and the danger of his absconding;" but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. SPEAKER called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen the Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 17, until the Evening Sitting, this day.

NATIONAL EXPENDITURE.

Ordered, That Mr. Austen Chamberlain be discharged from the Select Committee.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Hayes Fisher be added to the Select Committee." — (*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

Captain DONELAN: I have a Motion on the Paper to substitute the name of Mr. Michael Reddy.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The Motion cannot be made, but the hon. Gentleman may object to the name which has been proposed.

*Captain DONELAN: I do object, and with regard to the Gentleman whose name I proposed I say the Motion may be unusual, but the circumstances are also unusual, and the Irish Party desire to mark their appreciation, the admiration and esteem of their colleague who is now in prison. This is the opportunity they take of doing so. Although Mr. Reddy is at present undergoing hard labour in Tullamore Gaol, his colleagues, under the circumstances, appreciate him far more in prison than if he were on the floor of the House. Mr. Reddy was sentenced to imprisonment, and that sentence was confirmed by a county court judge who, within the last week, disgraced himself on the bench——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! These observations are not relevant to the Question before the House, namely, whether or not Mr. Hayes Fisher should be added to the Committee. The hon. Gentleman objected to that name, because he thought that another Irish representative should be on the Committee; but the hon. Member cannot discuss the merits of a particular name or person on the present Motion.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I object most strongly——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! Only one speech can be made.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (addressing Captain Donelan): You have not finished your speech yet.

Captain DONELAN: I venture to point out that Mr. Hayes Fisher——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member has already spoken.

(3.18.) Question put by Mr. Speaker in pursuance of Standing Order No. 16.

The House divided:—Ayes, 222; Noes, 76. (Division List No. 394.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Black, Alexander William
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cranborne, Viscount
Crombie, John William
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, Wm. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Emmott, Alfred
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Gladstone,Rt. HnHerbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gordon,Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore,Hn.G.R.C.Ormsby(Salop
Gore,Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon.Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene,Sir E W(B'ryS Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Rt HnLordG.(Mid'x
Hanbury,Rt. Hon.Robert Wm.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horniman, Frederick John
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier,Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jacoby, James Alfred
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawson, John Grant
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lee,ArthurH (Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Lowther,Rt.Hon.James (Kent
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Macartney,RtHnW.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh W
M'Laren,Sir Charles Benjamin
Manners, Lord Cecil
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Morgan,David J(Walthamst'w
Morley,Rt.Hn.John(Montrose
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederick Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rothschild,Hon.Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart,M.H.(Renfrew)
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer,RtHn.C.R(Northants
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Stewart,Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Strachey, Sir Edward
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomas,J.A.(Glam'rg'n,Gower
Thornton, Percy M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wallace, Robert
Walrond,Rt. HnSirWilliamH.
Walton,John Lawson(Leeds,S.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Wason, Eugene
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(T'unt'n
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.
Wharton,Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Williams,RtHnJ Powell-(Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley(York,E.R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor,Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham,William (Cork, N. E.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bell, Richard
Boland, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Field, William
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Jones,David Brynmor(Sw'nsea
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorge Smyth
Leamy, Edmund
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Govern, T.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mooney, John J.
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shee, James John
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reckitt, Harold James
Redmond, William (Clare)
Schwann, Charles E.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sullivan, Donal

Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.	Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.	TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Weir, James Galloway	Young, Samuel	Captain Donelan and Mr.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)	Yoxall, James Henry	Patrick O'Brien.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer		

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

(3.30.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he had an Amendment down to insert in page 3, line 6, after the word "necessary" the words "and which are provided by them." He wished to omit all the words after "necessary" to the end of the Clause.

MR. SEELY (Lincoln) reminded the Chairman that he had handed in an Amendment upon this point.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Both those Amendments are out of order. It has already been decided to include "all elementary schools," and the Committee have decided to include the provided as well as the non-provided schools.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that surely the word "necessary" was a limitation of the word "all." As the Clause stood, it was absolutely ungrammatical. This would be the only opportunity they would have of raising the question of the responsibility of the local authority to maintain out of the rates denominational schools, and they ought to have a clear issue in regard to this matter.

*THE CHAIRMAN: But the matter has already been discussed. On Friday last we discussed the question of leaving out "shall" to insert "may," and the debate turned upon whether a distinction was to be drawn between the schools provided and non-provided. The whole argument turned upon that, and the question was raised in that form.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W. R., Elland) said that was only a question of discretion on the part of the local authority.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) pointed out that the local authority would have had power as proposed, but under this Amendment the local authority would not have the power.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think you ought to have moved to omit the word "all." "All" means "all."

MR. M'KENNA said that if "all" meant "all" and included all qualifications, it must mean all unnecessary schools as well as necessary. "Necessary" was a qualification of "all."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE contended that, it having been ruled that "all" meant "all," the Clause was out of order.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The test is, what did the House mean when it passed the word "all." The Clause provides for "all public elementary schools within their area which are necessary." I think the intention of the Committee was to include all schools whether provided or not provided. I will deal as fairly as I can with hon. Members if they will deal fairly with me. [" Oh, oh!"]

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he hoped that observation did not apply to him. He submitted that the Opposition were entitled to discuss this issue. He contended that they ought to be allowed to discuss the question of rate-aid in some form or other.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) said that surely they had to consider the words grammatically. The words were "all public elementary schools," but that provision was subject to conditions which were afterwards added. The word "all" did not exclude all conditions, and why should this condition be excluded. "Which are necessary" was a condition put upon the word "all." Therefore, if there was one condition there might be another.

*THE CHAIRMAN: According to the general rule of interpretation upon which we have always acted where any general word such as "all" or "every" is inserted, the Committee intend that it shall have some signification, and that it is to have more signification than a word such as "a" or "the." In this case, however, there is a difference because of the words "which are necessary." That being so, I will give the hon. Member for Carnarvon the benefit of the doubt.

MR. SEELY said the object of the Amendment he had to move was to raise the question whether it was desirable that the voluntary schools should be compulsorily placed upon the county and borough rates. He did not move this Amendment from any motive of hostility to the Bill, which he thought would bring about a great improvement in education, but he was very anxious to avoid difficulties in the future. As an old manager, and a strong advocate for voluntary schools, he thought the method he was about to propose was better on the whole than the one which was at present in the Bill He foresaw very great difficulties in regard to the arrangement contained in the Bill if it came into force. Ultimately they would find that the people who paid the money for education would call the tune, and unless the voluntary subscribers continued to pay a reasonable share of the expenses of their schools, they would find these schools taken from them. Two proposals had come to the front during the agitation in the country this autumn. One was the suggestion of the hon. Member for the Newark Division, that four of the managers should be elected by the public authorities, and two by the foundation managers. Secondly, there was the proposal foreshadowed in the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury at Manchester, in which he spoke of the position of the managers as being like those under the School Board for London. In London managers were the servants of the School Board, and, as an advocate for voluntary schools, and a manager of them now, he did not appreciate the idea of being made simply the servant of the local education authority. He did not think the advantage they gained by this change would be maintained if the managers were deprived of all authority, deprived of the power of appointing and dismissing teachers, and relegated to the position of managers under the London School Board. He did not think there would be the great difficulty which some people seemed to think in obtaining the money from voluntary subscribers. He had put down an Amendment later on in the Bill to deal with the difficulty in those cases where subscriptions were not sufficient to maintain the schools in a state of efficiency. The Amendment was that instead of compelling the counties to support the voluntary schools, the counties and boroughs should be given the power, if they chose to exercise it, and if they could agree with the voluntary school managers, to give the voluntary schools such assistance as they required. That was all that was necessary. There was no real hostility between the voluntary schools and the public schools in the district generally. The voluntary schools were liked, and they got on very well with the people. Under a system of freedom, instead of a system of compulsion, these people would be able to manage their own affairs, and would be able to get over any difficulty and get sufficient money to support the schools in a state of efficiency. It was for that reason that he brought forward the Amendment, and it was for that reason that he pressed it upon the consideration of the Government and those anxious to maintain the voluntary schools in their present position. Many were anxious to maintain them for several reasons; for the sake of religious education—he did not mean for the sake of any particular dogmatic religious doctrine, but for the sake of the general religious atmosphere in the school—which, on the whole, had been preserved in the voluntary schools, and for the maintenance of which the continuation of the voluntary schools was exceedingly desirable. The number of board schools against which the allegation could be made that they had not given religious education was very small indeed, but the allegation had been made, and, having been made, it would be a great pity to do away with those schools which, at the present time, definitely stated that they wished to preserve a religious atmosphere. The Committee had heard a great deal as to giving to the School Board control over secular education, and no control to the managers over religious education. The superiority of the voluntary schools over the very small board schools in the country districts was due to the fact that the clergyman of the district was actively engaged in the welfare of the schools. He was the only educated man in the locality who had the time to give to its welfare. He usually had a university education and a knowledge of educational matters; at the same time, from the nature of his office, he was not a man who would be particularly anxious to submit himself to popular election and all the controversies arising therefrom; so that it was only by maintaining a system similar to the present voluntary school system that the interest of the large class of educated men in the country, who had sufficient time and opportunity for the purpose of maintaining their interest in elementary schools, could be retained. If full control were given to an outside body over the short time devoted to religious education, it would have the effect of taking away from the country schools one of the most valuable elements in their management. Under these circumstances it was most desirable to get over the difficulty in some way which would leave the voluntary schools in the same position as they were under the present system; not by giving greater control over secular education to the County Councils, but by leaving the voluntary schools as they were and giving an optional power to every borough council, and an opportunity to every voluntary school to obtain assistance from the rates. By such means every difficulty which had been urged upon the Committee could be got rid of. The difficulty of taxation without representation would be got over, because there would be no compulsory rate for the school. With the consent of the authority they could obviate the difficulty of the possibility of a rate going for the support of a school where the clergyman was foolish, and insisted upon teaching to the children doctrines contrary to the Church, because no County Council would give assistance to a man of that kind. It seemed to him that, while this would keep the Bill with all its value for the co-ordination of primary and secondary education in this country, it would place the voluntary schools in as strong a position as they were before, instead of placing them in the weaker position that they would be placed in under this Bill. There was one other thing that would have to be done if this proposal were adopted; the Clause in which the cost of the school was placed entirely on the county rate would have to be altered, and the cost of the annual maintenance, like the cost of the building, would have to be put on the individual parish in which the building was situated. There would be no difficulty in such a course, which had several advantages to commend it. It provided a way out of the difficulty of what to do with the endowed schools. What was to happen to the endowed schools under this Bill? The people in the parishes possessed of an endowed school had now no school cost, neither had they any school rate, yet these schools with their endowments were going to be placed under the whole county rate. Were these people going to be allowed to pay the county rate and get nothing for it? Or was the rate going to be taken away from them? Whatever was done, it would be found that the lumping of the parishes which managed their schools economically together with those which had been extravagant, would be very unpopular, and such a course would be strenuously opposed by the country. The county rate would be unpopular, and it would end in one thing and one thing only, the taking away in some way or another of the whole of the power of the management of the voluntary schools. For these reasons he urged the Government to think seriously before they attempted to compel the county authorities to support the voluntary schools out of the rates, and before they compelled the voluntary schools to receive money from the rates.

Amendment proposed—

In page 3, line 6, to leave out from the word "are," to the word "to," in line 7, and insert the words "provided by them, and, in the case of schools not provided by them, shall pay over to the managers of the school all moneys, including the annual Parliamentary grant received by them on account of the said school, subject"—(*Mr. Seely.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'necessary' stand part of the Clause."

(3.55.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I had rather hoped that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Carnarvon, who, as I understand, has a similar Amendment on the Paper, would have risen before I addressed the House upon this subject. The form of the Amendment by the omission of the word "necessary" agrees with that of the hon. Member for Carnarvon, though the object of my hon. friend is fundamentally opposed to that of the hon. Member opposite. It may be almost sufficient to remind the Committee that the acceptance of the Amendment would mean the actual destruction of the scheme of education which this legislation is to carry out. I do not agree to my hon. friend's Amendment, and cannot accept it, though I agree with much that has been said in its favour. I have never attempted to disguise the fact that there are voluntary schools in many parts of the country where the managers are under no pecuniary strain or difficulty, and regard the Bill as a very great interference with managerial rights which they have hitherto exercised, subject to no control but that from Whitehall. My hon. friend says that if this Amendment were passed many voluntary schools would assent, and I am not disposed to dissent from him. I have always said in the House, and out of it, that the great scheme of national education which the Government asks the country to accept, is one which requires some sacrifices from almost every class engaged in working the anomalous, unsatisfactory, and contradictory system under which the country groans. While I so far agree with my hon. friend, I hope he will notice that the whole plan of the Government for co-ordinating primary education would be absolutely shattered by the Amendment. It would be absolutely shattered, as far as voluntary schools are concerned by the fact that some would deliberately stay out of the scheme and others would be kept out by the action of a hostile or indifferent local authority. But it would not merely touch the voluntary schools, it would touch also the board schools. My hon. friend has truly pointed out that you could not possibly accept this Amendment without altering the whole principle of the county rate. The county rate would have to be abolished, and you would have to revert to the system which now prevails in the county area of having a local rate for each local school. That is an absolute destruction of the central county authority. From the very terms of the Amendment, that education authority would be excluded from the management of the voluntary schools except in those cases where they came to some kind of arrangement with the managers, and it would also be clearly impossible to maintain their authority over the present board schools. They will have authority over the provided schools for the future, because they pay for them, but as soon as you put the whole charge for the provided schools upon the locality, then the locality has a conclusive and irresistible right to manage the schools which it entirely maintains. Therefore I feel that, whatever else may be said, this Amendment is so absolutely revolutionary in character, it cuts so deeply at the very root of the Bill, and so effectually destroys the foundation on which the Bill is built, that it is one the Government could not possibly accept. I hope under these circumstances the hon. Member will think it hardly worth while to press it to a division.

Mr. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said that the question raised by the Amendment was really that of the application of rates to the support of denominational schools. He was not surprised that the hon. Member saw the danger of the proposal. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, on the previous Saturday, had justified the Clause, on the ground that it satisfied the Church of England. It was a matter for thankfulness that a clause had been devised which did satisfy the Church of England, but that was hardly a sufficient justification for the Committee accepting the proposal of the Government.

Sir JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) pointed out that he did not say it was a justification for the support of voluntary schools out of the rates, but that it was a provision which satisfied the Church of England and other religious bodies as to the maintenance of the denominational character of their schools, and that on that ground it might be acceptable.

Mr ALFRED HUTTON accepted the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, but thought it was not an argument which could be expected to justify the use of rates for the maintenance of voluntary schools. It was very convenient to use the county rather than the local rate, as by that means much local jealousy would be obviated, but it was still the use of rates for denominational purposes. If the right hon. Gentleman had a right to differentiate as to the management of the schools, the authority had a right to differentiate with regard to the treatment of the money which they provided out of the rates.

*Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) thought the hon. Member for Lincoln had based his Amendment largely upon his fear that the Bill in its present form would ultimately bring about the downfall of the denominational management of denominational schools. That was a contingency which perhaps the friends and foes of the Bill had not sufficiently perceived. In practice, the anticipation was likely to come true, and he was not concerned that it should not. The downfall of the denominational management of denominational schools was a condition precedent to any complete reform of the primary educational system of the country. He took it that the promoters of the Bill were as wide awake to the probable result of the measure in that respect as others could be, but possibly they thought that a plan whereby they got rid of denominational management, and yet retained the right to give denominational teaching in denominational schools, was one worth having amidst the general downfall which might come upon the system in other respects. The present Amendment, however, was only the preamble to another. Its mover was anxious to exclude from the compulsory part of the Bill voluntary schools as such, and to leave in their present unfair condition towards other schools the voluntary schools in parishes which at present did not contribute adequately, or even at all, by rates or otherwise, to the local cost of education. The effect of the Amendment would be that in the more than one-third of the country which contributed to education not at all by local rate, and very meagrely by subscription, this national and local grievance would remain untouched, and the great majority of voluntary schools would be left for an indefinite period in the present inefficient condition. By a subsequent Amendment the hon. Member for Lincoln proposed to empower the County or Borough Council, or other local rating authority, to extend to the voluntary schools within its area aid for the rates, if the Council could arrange with the voluntary school managers for that to be done. But that proposal depended on the Amendment before the Committee, and under the Bill the extension of rate-aid to denominational schools could take place only on conditions laid down in the Bill. Those conditions were certainly better than no statutory conditions at all. By the proposal of the hon. Member for Lincoln the County or Borough Council was to be free to come to terms in regard to rate-aid. This was very seldom done now, although the School Board could do it upon the condition that the management for secular purposes should be wholly under the control of the School Board. If this difficulty was so great under the statutory limitations of this Bill, how much greater would it be under the absolute absence of limitation which was foreshadowed by the Amendment of the hon. Member opposite. Option in this matter either from the point of view of education, or the welfare of the children was a mistake, and he should vote against the Amendment.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell N.) said he was surprised that this Amendment should come from the quarter it had done, because upon a former Clause the hon. Member voted in favour of striking out this option.

Mr. SEELY: I voted against it.

Dr. MACNAMARA said he understood that the hon. Member was rather anxious for the future of the denominational system, but he (Dr. Macnamara) was not. He was more anxious to get something done for the children. He had taken the trouble to turn up a Parliament Paper issued in 1900 which gave particulars for all elementary schools in England and Wales. It was issued in

August, 1899, and it gave the expenditure on all items. He would quote a few instances of schools in the County of Lincolnshire. In one school, with an average attendance of thirty-two, the expenditure on fuel, light, cleaning, repairs, taxes, and rent for the whole school for one year was 13s. 6d. or about 3d. per child. The effect of this Amendment would be that this school would continue with an expenditure of 3d. per child. In another school there were sixty-four children in average attendance, and upon the items he had mentioned they spent 5s. or about 1d. per child. Another column in the same Return gave the entire expenditure on books, apparatus, stationery, and furniture, and in one Lincolnshire school upon these items they spent 11s. 2d., or less than 2d. per child for seventy-five children. That would be continued under this Amendment. He objected to the continuance of this starved condition of education. In another Church school in the same county, with 150 children, the total expenditure upon the items he had mentioned was 26s. 4d. There were also schools in Carnarvonshire where they spent only 33s. 4d. on books, apparatus, stationery, and furniture for the whole year, and 29s. 7d. for lighting, fuel, cleaning, and repairs. This Parliamentary Paper was full of such instances. If they left these schools to the voluntary contributor, he would not pay, and those schools would continue in their present condition. The proposal of the Government he admitted would cause trouble, but the only way they could get a reform of their educational system was through the medium of a row. He did not object to a row at all. This Bill, at any rate, would wake up the English people, and he believed that the result would surprise his hon. friends opposite. He was, however, more concerned about the village schools being efficiently maintained. Rate-aid would cause great trouble and controversy, and if they had to have a row the sooner it came the better, and the sooner they got their schools on a proper basis, maintained from the public funds, the better.

*(4.30.) SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said the figures quoted by the hon. Member for North Camberwell could be easily explained. They knew perfectly well that it was the custom on some estates to provide the whole of the fuel for a school in the shape of coal and firewood. With regard to the cost of apparatus and other items mentioned by the hon. Member, he would remind the Committee that in those small country schools the cost might be very small one year because in the previous year a large amount had been expended upon those items. The argument of his hon. friend was therefore not valid as regarded those small schools. His hon. friend the Member for West Nottingham said he should vote against this proposal, because of a subsequent Amendment on the Paper. They were rarely logical having regard to Amendments. What they had to consider was the Amendment itself on its merits. If he understood the hon. Member for Lincoln, his proposal was: "Let the present state of things remain." That was to say, so long as the voluntary schools were carried on in this country efficiently and in every respect equal to the board schools, and what would now be the new county schools, they could go on on condition of receiving no rate-aid at all. He should be perfectly ready that the education authority should take over the schools if they were starved, and were inefficient, but he knew that in his own county the schools were as a rule carried on perfectly well and efficiently with the aid of subscriptions of money they received from the Government grant, and it was utterly unnecessary and quite gratuitous to impose these schools on the local rates of the county. The First Lord of the Treasury said the Amendment would destroy his great scheme. Well, undoubtedly it would destroy his great scheme of increasing the county rate. When the ratepayers were complaining of the rising rates in the country, the Government were proposing to put on the county rates a charge which was altogether unnecessary, they were going to take away a large part, if not the whole, of the benefit which had resulted from the passing of the Agricultural Rating Act. On these grounds he would support the Amendment.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the policy on which the hon. Member for North Camberwell opposed this Amendment was: "Let us do evil that good may come." The hon. Member wanted a row. That was a very proper spirit in which to approach the consideration of this subject. At the same time they might as well try to make a good Bill, and if they failed they would all be ready for a row. Some cases in Wales had been mentioned, and although he did not catch the names, he had no doubt that what the hon. Member said was in substance correct. One parish was mentioned where the charges amounted to 33s., but if the hon. Member only knew that parish he would know that this sum would go a long way. At the same time he was perfectly certain that what was now proposed would serve the purpose he had in view. Would it raise the level of education in that parish? There were parts of the country where they had very efficient School Boards. In these districts there was a rate of probably 1s. There was 1s. rate in the particular parish in which he lived. What would be the result if they had to levy rates for education all through the country? Places which were at present doing good work for education would suffer. They would be pulled down to the level of the country. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment supported it from the point of view of the voluntary schools. If the Amendment were rejected there was going to be great trouble and difficulty, and it was just possible that education might suffer for a whole generation. At the same time one would like to see his own generation get full educational facilities. That was the point of view he and his friends took. They objected to rate-aid being given to schools which were not managed by the ratepayers and where doctrines were taught which the majority of the ratepayers in a large number of districts thoroughly disapproved of. He knew it was asked why should they discriminate between rates and taxes? Well it was the genius of the English people. It was a genius which went in for illogical compromises. In Scotland, where there was a logical race, they did not draw the distinction, and a logical system was the outcome. In Wales, where there was a logical race, they objected to the Government proposal. That was the only reason he could give for discriminating between rates and taxes on this particular point. When they objected to the payment of taxes they could not really say how much went to education and how much to other objects, but they could do it when they paid rates. In connection with the payment of rates they could say how much in the pound in a particular county would go towards education in voluntary schools, but when they paid taxes on tobacco, beer, and tea they could not possibly divide. The reason why they discriminated between rates and taxes was that in the case of taxes it was utterly impossible to ascertain the amount contributed to a particular object. The amount contributed by a particular Church per child in the voluntary schools was about 6s. That covered the time that was devoted to the teaching of dogma and doctrine. Now the whole time was placed on the rates—the time given to dogma and that given to secular instruction—and, therefore, the Nonconformists said that in future religious instruction would be placed on the rates for the first time. It was said, "You want a religious atmosphere." That was the point of view of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich. But they wanted the atmosphere of their own particular sect. There was a good deal to be said for a good atmosphere in these schools, but what sort of atmosphere had they in hundreds of squalid little schools throughout the country? It was an Anglican atmosphere, and he objected to any rates going in aid of that atmosphere. At present a certain sect enjoyed privileges by which they were enabled to increase the number of their adherents in the Sunday schools. They had the patronage of 60,000 teachers, and they had all the honour, and glory, and glamour which came from managing the most important State communal institutions in 14,000 parishes in the country. What were they going to pay for it? It was all very well for the Member for Greenwich to say "If you decline to pay rates for our schools, we will decline to pay rates for your schools." Half the School Boards of the country were manned by Churchmen. The

School Boards of Manchester and Liverpool, and, until recently, the great School Board of London, and even the School Board of Birmingham were manned by denominationalists. Wherever Churchmen were in a majority they manned the board schools, but if they went to the sectarian districts it did not matter whether the Nonconformists were in a majority or not, they had not this monopoly of the management. In the board schools the majority of the teachers were Churchmen. In a board school nothing was taught which was of offence to the conscience of any Churchman, but he could point to many cases of voluntary schools in which doctrines were taught which were of offence to the Nonconformist parishioners. Was it not therefore fair that those who had special privileges, advantages, and patronage should be asked to contribute something towards the maintenance of these schools? If this were done—he did not say it would remove their objections—at any rate there would be still substantial objections remaining—but it would remove a certain objection. It would simply put them on the same footing as did the Bill of 1895–6, which provided for a grant in aid, subject to conditions. That Bill was objected to, but this Bill was far worse and more offensive. All that they asked was, to begin with, that rate-aid should be eliminated from the Bill, and that this special privilege given to the Church should be paid for. The same thing applied to all the other sects. If that were done pressure could be brought to bear by the County Councils to improve the school buildings, and the condition of the Church schools would thereby be forced up and put on a level of efficiency with the board schools. He insisted that the Government would do wisely, and in the interest of their Bill, if they did something to eliminate this matter. They must know perfectly well that this rate business was intolerable to the vast majority of the electors of the country. [Cries of "No!" from the Ministerial Benches.] The hon. Member opposite who cried "No" represented a constituency not far removed from Devonport. What about rate-aid there? Did the Conservative candidate stand for rate-aid there to the voluntary schools? On the contrary, he avoided all reference to rate-aid, but talked of a grant-in-aid to the dockyard labourers. If he were elected and came into the House it was not rate-aid for voluntary schools he would support the Government on, but if the Government did not give the extra shilling to the dockyard labourers he would, Education Bill or no Education Bill, vote against them. Really this Education Bill was running up a big account against the Government. It would cost them 1s. a week extra to the dockyard labourers, as it had cost them £900,000 in the interest of their own supporters. If the Government accepted this Amendment the Colonial Secretary would then be free to address an open meeting in Birmingham. The right hon. Gentleman need not then lock the doors against his own constituents and turn out the reporters. He need not unnerve them all by his lurid pictures of what would happen if he did not control the destinies of the world. They might return to their normal condition and discuss things afterwards on a purely educational basis. Let the Government eliminate this great controversial issue of rate-aid to the voluntary schools and then they could go on to the next Amendment.

(4.50.) MR. M'KENNA said he wished to say a few words in regard to the Nonconformist objections to paying the educational rate for voluntary schools. That objection had been misunderstood by the First Lord of the Treasury. In his speech in Manchester the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "Well, I make a challenge. I make a challenge of a very simple kind. Will any one tell me what this fundamental principle of morality is? I will engage to show either that it is, on the face of it, not a fundamental principle of morality, or that if it is, it has been consistently violated in England and Scotland by Nonconformists for the last thirty years."

Although he was a humble member of the Nonconformist body, he nevertheless ventured to take up the challenge and to show the right hon. Gentleman that there was a moral ground on the part of Nonconformists to resist paying education rates under this Bill, and that that moral ground had not been consistently violated for the last thirty years. There was a vital difference between the payment of rates and taxes for the support of voluntary schools. The payment of taxes during the last thirty years was for work done, viz., the teaching of certain defined secular subjects—the value of that teaching being tested by inspection and examination. That was the principle of the Bill of 1870. On the Second Reading of the Bill of 1870 Mr. Gladstone said—

> "It was in our view essential to the success of this measure that so far as the funds of the State—and I use the term now in the narrow sense of that which proceeds from the Imperial Treasury—that so far as the funds of the State were concerned they should be applied only for secular results." *

Then later in the same speech Mr. Gladstone said—

> "On the one hand, there is a very strong and vivid opinion among a large and active part of the community, that the safe course in the matter of national education is to limit the application of public funds to secular instruction. That is the principle on which our Privy Council system has always been founded; because, although it may be said that you had deviated from the rigour of that system in permitting inspection in regard to religious results, yet it has been always seen that the amount of public aid has left a large void to be supplied by private benevolence, and this it is which supplies the means of religious instruction."†

Again, in the same speech, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "We may entirely escape from the evils attending these controversies in the local Boards in connection with voluntary schools, and we may, at the same time, do justice to these voluntary schools, and prevent any of that action of religious prejudice against particular, and possibly, in some places, obnoxious, Communions, which may give cause of complaint; and we may at the same time adhere to what I hold to be the fundamental principle of the Bill ——"

nothing could be clearer than this—

> "Namely, that the funds of the Exchequer, whatever discretion you give to the local Boards, are to be dispersed solely and exclusively for secular results."

That was the account of 1870: the funds of the State were to be "dispersed solely and exclusively for secular results."‡ A margin was to be found for the provision of a religious atmosphere by the voluntary subscribers. It was that margin which was now under this Bill to be put on the rates. Therefore, the Nonconformists said that they had a moral ground of objection to supplying the money for the teaching of denominational creeds and dogmas in which they did not believe. It might be said that that was only a technical objection to voting money to pay for religious instruction, and that there was margin enough in the payment for the schools and their maintenance and repair to cover the cost of the religious teaching. That contention was altogether fallacious. In the first place they had it on the very highest authority that the teaching in the denominational schools must include the maintenance of the religious atmosphere; and, therefore, it was idle to say that the religious instruction was limited to two or three hours in the week. The instruction must be in an Anglican atmosphere, because it was only in that way that the schools could be used as a back door to the Church.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said that that was putting his views in a manner in which he did not recognise them at all.

MR. M'KENNA said he understood the noble Lord to claim that in the denominational schools, it was necessary that the religious atmosphere should be maintained.

LORD HUGH CECIL said he did not remember saying that. He was referring to the training colleges, and perhaps that was what the hon. Member was thinking of.

MR. M'KENNA said he was referring to a most eloquent speech which the noble Lord delivered on the Second Reading of the Bill.

LORD HUGH CECIL said that he certainly did not say so in that speech.

MR. M'KENNA said that then, in that case, he would withdraw his remark. Whether it had been said by the noble Lord himself or not, the point had certainly been raised over and over again by persons responsible for controlling the voluntary schools. It was raised at the Church Congress: and it had certainly been raised in behalf of the Roman

---

* (3) *Debates*, ccii., 269.

† (3) *Debates*, ccii., 272.

‡ (3) *Debates*, ccii., 279.

Catholics. Therefore, it could not be said that three, four, or five hours per week of denominational teaching covered the whole of the expenditure of public money. The point raised by his hon. friend remained unanswered. The Government proposed not only to give rate-aid to those denominational schools, but to allow to the Anglican Church the whole of the patronage of 70,000 civil servants, which the schoolmasters would become, drawing salaries amounting in the aggregate, to not less than £4,000,000 sterling a year. Was it to be said that that annual asset would be covered by the annual value of the buildings used? The Nonconformists' objection to the payment of the education rate was, therefore, not merely technical, but a matter of principle, and they were justified in drawing a distinction between taxes and rates. Formerly, the voluntary schools were private schools used by the State for giving secular instruction, but now they were to be made public schools, and the rates were to be used for the direct purpose of denominational education.

Mr. SEELY said he should like before the debate closed, to say a word or two in regard to it. The First Lord of the Treasury had said he could not accept the Amendment, because it would destroy the Bill; but he would like to urge on the right hon. Gentleman for his future consideration that this Clause was not an essential part of the Bill. It seemed to him that the really essential and valuable parts of the Bill in the point of view of the country were two—first, that providing for secondary instruction, and second, that providing for the co-ordination of education in the hands of the County Councils and District Councils. Those objects would not be interfered with by this Amendment, which would provide a way out of the difficulties which were not so obvious in this House, but which in the country were very real and very grave indeed. A number of public authorities had declared that they were not willing to carry out the provisions of this Bill unless a majority of the managers of the voluntary schools were given to their appointment. That difficulty might be overridden, but great difficulty would be placed in the way of the working of this Bill if it was sought to override these authorities. His opinion was that it would be wiser to give up the compulsory assistance from the rates to the voluntary schools, and make it optional. Hon. Members opposite in their opposition to the Amendment had rather let the cat out of the bag, and had shown that those interested in the teachers had been exerting a similar kind of pressure to that which was being put upon candidates at Devonport at the present time. The desire for the County rate was not so strong on the part of managers and those interested in education, as it was in the interest of a number of people who desired to have an unlimited fund into which they might put their hand. He asked County Members to consider what would occur under this Bill. All over the country pressure would be exercised to raise every school up to the position of the most expensive, quite regardless of efficiency or any necessity for it, but simply because every parish would desire to get as much out of the rates as possible. He was not prepared to agree with what had fallen from hon. Members as to the inefficiency of voluntary schools. He knew many of them, and his experience was that they were thoroughly efficient. And when all this talk was heard as to the want of education in the country; of the loss of trade and commerce because of the want of education, without which we could not compete with foreign countries; of commercial travellers being unable to compete with foreigners owing to their ignorance of foreign languages, he would point out that that was not primary but secondary education. His contention was that by retaining the compulsory power in the Bill they were, so far from doing good to education, doing evil, and it was for that reason that he had moved this Amendment, and not, as it had been suggested, for the purpose of destroying the Bill. He did not wish to detain the House, and as it was well known that at the present time a division was simply a waste of time he begged leave to be allowed to withdraw the Amendment. [Cries of "No."]

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) thought it was a novel method on the part of an hon. Member to initiate a discussion lasting an hour and a quarter, and then to ask leave to withdraw the Amendment. In his opinion it would be no waste of time to go to a division, and he trusted the House would not allow the Amendment to be withdrawn without an opportunity being given to divide upon it. Why was it a waste of time ? Was it because the whip of the Party opposite was so strong that hon. Members opposite dare not vote for it ? Had the command gone forth that any one might voice their opinion, and that when the time came to divide they must walk out of the House ? The Amendment of the hon. and gallant Member was a very invidious one. He had not appreciated the full importance of it when listening to the first speech of the hon. and gallant Member, but in his second speech he had thrown a great deal of light upon it. The hon. and gallant Member had spoken about option. Who was to have the option ? The position which the hon. Member had advocated, appeared to be that wherever these schools could be maintained the managers need not go to the educational authority, and could say "Hands off !" so that there would be no power over these schools, although the grant from the Treasury was going to be increased. Then the hon. and gallant Member took up the position that if these schools did desire a contribution they were to have it. The option was altogether on one side, and it showed that the desire was to keep the denominational schools intact, and entirely separate. As the Prime Minister had said, if the speech of the hon. Member carried the Amendment, the whole of the Bill would be gone, but the real object of the Amendment was to see that the voluntary schools were aided either by grants or rates. He submitted that the voluntary schools had no right to receive assistance unless they were governed by the people themselves.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he was not surprised that the Prime Minister was unable to accept the Amendment, because it certainly went to the heart of the Bill. The Bill aimed at replacing the voluntary sub-sections by compulsory sub-sections in the form of rates. The voluntary subscribers came to the House and said, "We will subscribe no longer ; will you put the ratepayers in such a position as to be compelled to subscribe to these schools ?" In this case the old proverb, "Beggars cannot be choosers," apparently did not hold good, because the Church in this matter wished to do the begging and to choose as well. That was what the country resented. The Vice President of the Council had said at Cambridge recently that the Church managers had come and said they would accept certain conditions, and the Government agreed. That was what was objected to. If the Church came, *in forma pauperis*, and said she could no longer afford to carry on these schools, it was only right that the ratepayers who had to support them should choose the conditions under which they should continue to exist. If the Amendment went to a division he should support it.

(5.13) Question put.

Committee divided :—Ayes, 235 ; Noes, 99. (Division List, No. 395.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel

Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, HnG. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W (B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, RtHnLordG (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harwood, George
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'sham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Manners, Lord Cecil
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J. (Walth'stow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, H. M. (Renfrew)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Stuart, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H. (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Younger, William
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Logan, John William
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Priestley, Arthur
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Seely and Mr. Lloyd-George.

(5.30.) MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) thought all would agree that they should try to make the new educational machinery work as smoothly as possible. According to the recent reports of inspectors, many schools in different parts of the country were not structurally suitable for the purposes for which they were used. At present the grants made to schools were dependent on certain conditions, and returns had been presented of schools that failed to comply with those conditions. Under the Code, the Board of Education required to be satisfied that the school premises were healthy, properly constructed and arranged for teaching, efficiently lighted, drained, and ventilated, and so on; but a number of schools, both voluntary and Board, failed to come up to the standard required by the State. It was therefore very desirable that before the great transfer to the new local authorities took place due inquiry should be made into these matters, and that in order to avoid the friction which might otherwise arise, it should be enacted that only such schools as were structurally suitable were to be put on the local authorities. In the interests of the smooth working of the scheme the Committee would do well to accept the Amendment of which he had given notice.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 6, after the word "necessary," to insert the words "and for which the buildings are structurally suitable."—(*Mr. Helme.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said that everyone would cordially sympathise with the desire of the hon. Member to improve the structural and sanitary conditions and the general convenience and comfort of the schools, but it took time and persistence to effect those improvements. The attention of successive Presidents of the Board of Education had been directed to that end, but the result was not yet wholly satisfactory. The new local authorities, however, would almost inevitably strengthen the hands of the Board of Education in this matter. Would the Amendment really promote the object the hon. Member had in view? Its effect might be to postpone the whole operation of the Bill while a general inquiry was being made, and the buildings from end to end of the United Kingdom surveyed—until the local authorities and the Board of Education between them came to the conclusion that the buildings were structurally suitable and such as they would wish to see provided for the education of the children. That would not only cause considerable delay and inconvenience, but would for some time postpone the stimulating and strengthening influence of the local authority. The object of the hon. Member would be better attained by letting the Bill come into immediate operation, because as soon as the local authority acquired its powers, so far as the schools provided by itself were concerned, the matter would be in its own hands, while, as regarded the schools not provided, one of the conditions under which assistance from the rates would be secured was that the managers made such alterations and improvements in the buildings as might reasonably be required, and if any question arose between the local authority and the managers as to that "reasonable requirement" it would be settled by the Board of Education. The Board would welcome the strengthening and stimulating influence of the local authorities. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire had recently declared that under the present sinister influences which prevailed, the best energies of the President and Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Education would be devoted to thwarting the praiseworthy efforts of local authorities to put the education of the country on a proper footing. He assured the Committee, however, that so long as he had anything to do with the Board of Education the suggestions of the local authorities would not be regarded by him—and he was sure he could say the same of his noble friend the President—as *primâ facie* unreasonable, but would receive the most careful attention. For the reasons he had given he hoped the Amendment would not be pressed.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said the hon. Member was entirely mistaken in supposing he attributed any sinister motives to him; on the contrary, he said he would act under the most conscientious convictions. The objection raised by his hon. friend, and one which the ratepayers would feel very strongly, was to the local authority being called upon to take over at once a quantity of dilapidated property which was unfit for the purpose to which it was devoted. If the Amendment were carried and the voluntary managers were told that they would not have the benefit of the Bill until the buildings were put in a decent state of repair, the alterations would be done at once; but if they were enabled to get the aid of the rates in respect of schools which were unsuitable, there would be a great deal of delay before the improvements and repairs were carried out. The machinery under the Bill was that they were to be called upon by the Board of Education to put the buildings in repair. That would take some time, and consequently the proprietors of these entirely unsuitable buildings would get—

Sir WILLIAM ANSON reminded the right hon. Gentleman that the buildings, so far from being entirely unsuitable, had to be found structurally suitable before they could get the Parliamentary grant.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said his complaint was that the Board did not enforce that requirement, otherwise schools would not be structurally unsuitable. They did not wish an intolerable strain to be put upon the only people who were to make contributions to voluntary schools. They ought to have the security that before these schools derived the advantage of the rates they ought not to compel the local authority to take over unsuitable buildings. If that principle were established they would get the buildings made suitable at once, but if not, heaven knew how long they would have to wait. Suppose that such a demand were made upon the foundation managers, correspondence would take place with Whitehall upon the subject of some particular improvement, and anyone who knew anything about controversies of that kind knew that it might be a very long time before they got anything done under those circumstances. His hon. friend wished that before these schools were taken over this question should be settled.

(5. 50) Dr. MACNAMARA said he was very glad to hear the speech of the Secretary to the Board of Education, because he recognised that they were now raising a question which was really vital to the health as well as to the education of the children. If they compelled people to send their children to school they must see that the schools were suitable. Many of the voluntary schools were in a dilapidated condition, and it was a fact that some of His Majesty's Inspectors of schools were guilty of a conspiracy of silence in respect of a great many of these buildings, which they "wink" at because they know the managers could not put them into a proper condition. There must not be any more winking at these schools,

and they must see that a really reasonable standard of efficiency was maintained. The first grant for the building of these schools was made in 1839. He had consulted a Blue-book on this subject issued in February, 1840, in which it was stated that a good barn might easily be converted into a schoolroom. If they acted on the advice of the Government at that time, and utilised the barns, what must be the condition of those schools sixty years after? They must now take up a more rigid attitude altogether as regarded the suitability of those buildings. Three years ago, Mr. Fisher, the Inspector for the Plymouth District, said that two schools in his area were at present under sentence of condemnation. In one case part of the ground floor was used as a stable, which was underneath the main room in which the scholars were taught. The other school was built in a churchyard where burials took place, and where a grave was made within a few feet of the schoolroom window. Those were extreme cases, but there were many unsuitable schools, and they ought to alter all that state of things now. In one instance there was a school in as bad a condition as it could possibly be, and yet it might go on for years as a voluntary school. At last the managers gave up the struggle and transferred it. It was at once condemned, and the School Board had to build a new school. They wanted to see that there could not be any more of those unsuitable premises. He deplored very much indeed the recent speech made by the Marquess of Londonderry, for it seemed to him to be an intimation to the inspectors of schools to go on passing badly-lighted and badly-equipped schools. Lord Londonderry spoke of the luxurious accommodation provided by the School Board for London. London board schools were clean, well lighted, and well ventilated, but they were not luxurious, and were only equipped with the ordinary necessities of school life. Lord Londonderry said that although some of the country schools were deficient they gave the very best education. He denied that. He granted that they met the requirements of the Board of Education, and he wondered that they were able to produce the results they did from an intellectual point of view under such difficulties. There was another side to the question. He could introduce the Lord President to many country teachers and children who have suffered because of the undesirable character of the premises in which they spent their days. He should like to know how many teachers were on the Invalid Fund under the Teachers Superannuation Bill on account of the bad condition of the village schools. Some years ago he tabulated 421 returns of most of the village schools and the older voluntary schools of the towns, and he found that more than 25 per cent. of them were schools which ought to have been condemned long ago, because of their unsuitability. The hon. Member for North West Ham, in a presidential address to the National Union of Teachers, said he had no hesitation in saying that many of the buildings used as schools were in such a disgraceful condition that it was impossible for children to spend five hours per day in them without suffering physical and moral injury. The schools were reported to be damp, not in good repair, the ventilation was not good, and they were not well lighted. The speech of the Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Education showed that he desired that this thing should be improved, and as a practical man he must proceed step by step and do the best he could in the circumstances. He hoped that the Board of Education would be more strenuous in future, and that the inspectors would not pass so many of these buildings. He had never spoken strongly on the matter in the past because he felt that if they had not the money they could do nothing. Probably the inspectors took the view that if they condemned these buildings the result would be to set up a village School Board. He admitted at once that a village School Board as an alternative to the voluntary school managers was not always to be chosen as the best educational expedient. If time permitted he could give startling instances of the incapacity of the village School Board. Speaking generally, a country village was too small as a unit of administration. The Parliamentary Secretary referred to Clause 8 of the Bill, and it was no doubt set forth there that—

> "The managers of the school shall, out of funds provided by them, keep the school house

in good repair, and make such alterations and improvements in the buildings as may be reasonably required by the local education authority."

He had a rather serious question to bring before the Parliamentary Secretary in regard to this. Many of the buildings ought not to be used as schools, being entirely unfit for the purpose. The local education authority ought to say, and must say, to the voluntary school managers that they must build a new school, or they would build one themselves out of the public funds. What was the standard the local authority was to go on? Up to last year there was an admirable schedule in the Education Code dealing with the planning of elementary schools.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: The building rules will very shortly be in the hands of hon. Members. There is no need for any anxiety on the matter.

DR. MACNAMARA said he had a little anxiety on the matter. He thought he was entitled to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the schedule dealing with the planning of school buildings had suddenly and mysteriously disappeared from the Code on the eve of Parliament imposing a new obligation on the local authorities. The circumstance was suspicious, to say the least of it, for it seemed as if the Government were afraid to put in the hands of the new local authorities a standard which would make it difficult for the managers to carry out their work in existing buildings, many of which were unsuitable for the purposes of educational work.

(6.8.) SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) thought the reply of the Parliamentary Secretary in regard to this Amendment was based on an incorrect foundation. The hon. Baronet stated that an immense time would have to elapse between the passing of the Bill and its coming into operation. He could not appreciate the force of that objection at all. The Act would come into operation at once. The question was whether the buildings now in use were or were not fit for use as schools. He thought the Committee had a right to say that before these schools and other buildings were taken over and provided for in future out of public funds they should be structurally suitable, at least for carrying on the work of a school. If the buildings were structurally unsuitable for the work of a school to be carried on, if the denominational authority practically provided nothing for the school, where was the force of the Prime Minister's argument that this authority should have a preponderating voice in the management of the school? The supporters of the Amendment had a right to ask the Government to insert it, or equivalent words, in the Clause to say that the denominational managers should provide structurally suitable buildings, and that this need should be complied with at once on the requisition of the education authority before money was found for the carrying on of these schools. But how were they to compel the voluntary managers, and where were the funds to come from? Were they to compel the managers to raise a subscription? They could do nothing in this respect, and the money would have to be found out of the rates. As the public authority, therefore, would insist upon having buildings structurally suitable and properly equipped, the argument of those who supported the Amendment was strengthened if the public money was to be spent, not only in carrying on the school, but really in building a new school. The grant of that public money should be accompanied by popular control.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that on every ground some such words as these ought to be accepted by the Government. He regarded the speech of the Parliamentary Secretary as a mere temporising speech to stave over a difficulty. The new authorities were to be overlookers of the education of the country and Parliament ought not to saddle them with schools which were totally unfit for the work to be carried on. The Parliamentary Secretary said the matter would be looked into by the Board of Education in London, but everybody knew that the Board winked at these defects. When the country was making a new start in educational policy liberty ought to be conceded to the new authorities to say whether or not in their opinion the work of education should be continued in these buildings. He declined to entrust Lord Londonderry with a decision of this kind. He was not sure that according to the Bill even the Marquess of Londonderry would have any power. At any rate he would have very little power, because the subsection of the Bill to which reference had been made by the hon. Member for North Camberwell referred merely to alterations and improvements of existing buildings, and he made bold to say that, in a dispute between the managers of a denominational school and the new education authority, the latter could not for a moment with success contend that they could order the building to be pulled down. How could they make a cow house, or a stable, or a barn into a good school? It could not be done, and yet that was all the power that was given to the new education authority. The first essential for elementary education was to have a proper building, not one adapted from an erection which was structurally unfit. He maintained that the House had an absolute right to declare first, that the new education authorities should not be burdened with improper structures, and, secondly, that, having the duty cast upon them to provide proper education, they must provide it in proper places under proper conditions, and that they themselves should decide, without appeal, whether a school was suitable or not. If there was to be any delay at all, it would arise from this appeal to the Board of Education. Did the friends of the Bill really mean to say that the education authority should do everything else in education, but should not be empowered to say whether a room was fit for educational purposes? A good solid test of the *bonâ fides* of the intentions of the Government on the question of efficiency in education could be had in their attitude to this question. If the Government intended that education ought to be properly given in properly-constructed buildings they would at once accept the Amendment.

MR. TREVELYAN said that the question was what authority was to be trusted to improve the structural condition of the voluntary schools. There was no difference of opinion that they wanted improvement. There were three authorities—the Board of Education, the local authority, and the managers. The Parliamentary Secretary had said that the education authority was capable of applying pressure to those school managers, and was to be trusted to do it, but the most emphatic sentence in Lord Londonderry's speech on Friday, in addressing the school inspectors, was—what no doubt was a truism—that education was not confined to seats and desks and good buildings. It was a very good thing that Lord Londonderry should address himself to the kind of education given by the teachers, but he went on to say that he deprecated the too rigid application of building rules. So much for the Department; but what about the managers? Unfortunately they found in many parts of England the managers of the voluntary schools were declaring that it was very likely that they would not be able to find the money for the structural necessities of the school buildings. The Leamington and Warwick Clerical Society had said it had yet to be shown that the rank and file of the Church school managers had the funds, or where these were to be found. Of course, the subscriptions would cease, for they would not pay as subscribers and be taxed at the same time. If the Church school managers were not going to find the money for structural repairs, one of two things must happen—either the structural repairs would not be made, or the Government would have to drop out the Clause at a later stage. The Amendment proposed to call in the assistance of the only remaining authority to insist on the alterations being made—that authority which the Government said they trusted so implicitly.

MR. M'KENNA asked how the Government proposed to compel the managers to make the school buildings structurally suitable. The Secretary to the Board of Education had said that sub-Clause (*d*) provided for keeping the school house in proper repair; but, supposing the managers did not obey, what was to happen? It was conceivable that, for want of funds, the managers could not make such reasonable alterations as might be required. Would the First Lord accept one or other of the Amendments standing later on the Paper which provided that, "If the managers are unable or unwilling to carry out these requirements, or fail to carry them out with due despatch, the local education authority shall have the right themselves to make such repairs, alterations, and improvements as are sanctioned by the Board of Education, and any school thereafter maintained in such buildings shall be held to be a school provided by that authority." If the First Lord would accept that Amendment he would advise his hon. friend to withdraw his Amendment.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that if the hon. Member would read Clause 8, he would see that one condition under which a school was maintained was that the managers did what was provided in sub-Section (*d*). That being so, what would happen in case of non-compliance would be that the school would cease to be maintained.

MR. M'KENNA said that time would be lost if the local authority had to go to the Board of Education to get their sanction to build another school. The managers would have the local education authority in the hollow of their hand, and he submitted that the remedy apparently was to stop education in the school and district.

(6.25) MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said that he hoped that some answer would be given to the arguments urged in favour of the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had listened with great patience to the debate. Some hon. Gentlemen surely wished to defeat the Bill, and if the Bill was defeated those schools would go on exactly as they were at present. The second alternative was that if the Bill passed, the local authority would in any case in which the structure of a school required alteration and improvement, inform the managers. The managers would either be able to carry out the instructions given to them or not. If they could not carry them out, the school would cease to be a voluntary school, the education authority would have to provide its school, and that school would be a publicly provided school. There would be no further denominational education, and he would have thought that hon. Gentleman opposite would have much preferred that, so that he could not really see what it was that those gentlemen had to complain of.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said he would not have risen after the speech of the right hon. Member for West Monmouth, if they had had a more satisfactory answer to the arguments put before the Committee from that side of the House. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that there were a large number of schools which were structurally unfit, and surely it was not desirable that the new local authority should take over bad schools. The point made was simply this—a large number of the voluntary schools were in an undesirable condition, and the local authorities, if they were to fall back on the school managers of these schools, would find that they were really bankrupt. For that there was no provision in this Bill, except with that undue delay which the Secretary to the Board of Education deprecated. It seemed to him that these words were the necessary complement of sub-Section (*d*) and were by no means unnecessary. The whole trouble was that there were a large number of schools in which education was not carried on properly at the present time, and which, in the future, if their education was to become efficient, would have to fall back on the voluntary subscribers. It was because the voluntary schools were behind that this Bill was brought in, yet the schools were told that they were to trust in the future to the efforts which had not been successful in the past.

MR. FLETCHER MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston) said the remedy, if there was no obedience to this condition, was not that the school ceased to be a school earning the support of the local education authority, but the only punishment was that it lost the Parliamentary grant. The obligation, however, to keep the school going and to maintain it was found in the first words of Clause 8, and was not removed by this disobedience. The disobedience of the managers would therefore punish the local education authority, who would be obliged to maintain the school without the aid of the Parliamentary Grant. What they wanted to do by this Amendment was simply to make the structural suitability of the school a condition precedent, if he might use a legal term, to the taking of it over. As the matter stood, it was not a condition precedent, and the sole remedy was for the educational authority to proceed against the managers, and possibly get a *mandamus* against them, but the duty to maintain the school without the Parliamentary grant remained just as before. If the Premier would accept an Amendment to sub-Section 2, and make it stand thus: "in order that it may rank as a public elementary school" they would be quite satisfied, but all it said at present was "in order to maintain the Parliamentary grant," and so long as it stood in that form it was quite possible for a school to continue under inferior conditions in defiance of the local authority.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. and learned Gentleman might be right or he might be wrong as to the legal interpretation of the Clause as it stood, that he (Mr. Balfour) had stated the policy of the Government in this matter very frequently. If the Clause did not carry that out, let them get on to that part of it where this Amendment was thought to be necessary, and if it was necessary it would be accepted. This was not the point at which it was required.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said he differed entirely from the right hon. Gentleman. He thought the right hon. Gentleman did not appreciate the point of the Amendment, which was that no school should be taken over at all if its building was not in a condition structurally suitable. That was, by the Amendment, to be a condition precedent to any operation of the Bill. Surely that was a most reasonable view to take of this matter. It had already been admitted by the Secretary to the Board of Education that there were in the country now a great number of schools structurally unsuitable, and owing to the construction of the Bill all these schools would be taken over, however bad they might be, and the first thing the County Councils would have to do would be to press the managers to put them into a suitable condition structurally. But there was no means in the Bill as it stood of coercing the managers. If this change was not made in the Clause, the managers would hold the key of the position, for they would only have to say, "Here are the schools you are required to take over." He submitted that time would be saved in the long run if they had made it a condition precedent rather than that the matter should be made the means of a controversy between the educational authorities and the managers.

* MR. DUKE (Plymouth) said the right hon. Gentlemen's proposal amounted to this, that although the managers of the schools continued to carry on their schools in buildings which for twenty or thirty years had been approved for the purpose, a hostile local authority might at the end of this year refuse to provide anything for the expenditure which had been incurred. The proposal was a monstrous one, and was intended to destroy the voluntary schools.

MR. WALLACE (Perth) was amazed at the application of the word "monstrous" to an Amendment which merely sought to provide that the schools were structurally suitable. He had understood from the Prime Minister that the whole basis of the Bill was trust in the local authorities, and he could not imagine for a moment that there was a single Member in the House who thought that a building which was structurally unsuitable for a school should be forced upon the local authority, yet that was the proposition which was made by the Bill as it stood.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked what was to be done if the local authorities said to the managers "You must repair your buildings" and the latter declined or neglected to comply with the demand? The school might be closed for eighteen months while the matter was being fought out. How would they bridge over that interval, during which time there might be no school at all in the parish? All that was asked by the Amendment was that there should be the same remedy as that which they had in the matter of roads at the present moment. When it was a question of taking over a road, the highway authority said "We will take over your road provided that in the first place you put it into proper repair." They desired that that principle should be incorporated in this Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he failed to see that this Amendment saved any time, except that it might save the time required for asking the Education Department to investigate the justice of the claims put forward by the local authority. If that was the only difference between them, it ought to be decided not on this Clause, but on the subsequent one.

(6.48.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 111; Noes, 249. (Division List No. 396.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carn'rvonshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Priestley, Arthur
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Charles Prestwich (Leigh
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, J A (Gl'morgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready

Colston,Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,Sir HoratioD(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-HartlandSirFredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes, HonAylwynEdward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,SirRobertPenrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS(Warwick.S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary(St. Albans)
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore,HnG R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore,Hon.S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon.George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,Sir EW(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene,HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Greene,W.Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.RobertWm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Heath,James (Staffords.N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse,Henry (Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,Fav'rsh'm
Howard, J.(Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon,HonGeo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, ArthurH (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lowther,Rt.Hon.James(Kent)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col.Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macartney,RtHnW.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver SirLewis(EdinburghW
Manners, Lord Cecil
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild,Hon.LionelWalter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart,M.H.(Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,AbelH.(Hertford,East)
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester).
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUni.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond,RtHn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunt'n
Welby,Sir CharlesG.E.(Notts.
Wharton,Rt. Hon. JohnLloyd
Whiteley H(Ashton-und-Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,A. Stanley(York,E.R.
Wilson-Todd,Wm.H.(Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor,HenryWilson
Wortley,Rt.Hon.C.B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(7.0.) Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 6, after the word 'necessary,' to insert the words 'and have the control of all expenditure required for that purpose other than expenditure for which under this Act provision is to be made by the managers.'"—(*Mr. Alexander Brown.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."—(*Mr. Alexander Brown.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I accept this Amendment.

DR. MACNAMARA, pointing out that the Amendment proposed to give the control of expenditure to the local authority, asked how far the unrepealed portion of the Act of 1870 would permit the local authority absolutely and entirely to delegate all that financial control to the managers. The First Lord of the Treasury, at Manchester, was under a serious misapprehension when he said—

> "We have borrowed the term 'manager' from the Act of 1870, and in that Act the terms 'managers' and 'management' do not carry with them the idea of control."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps I ought to have said "necessarily."

DR. MACNAMARA (continuing) quoted Section 15 of the Act of 1870.

> "The School Board may, if they think fit, from time to time delegate any of their powers under this Act, except the power of raising money, and in particular, may delegate the control . . . and management of the schools'."

He thought it very desirable that the Government should look over that section and see whether it would not be necessary to repeal some part of it if that financial control was not to be directly delegated. There might be no objection to a directly elected body delegating this control, but there was a serious objection to a nominated body delegating the control to another body of persons, only two out of six of whom represented the public.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said his impression was that it would not be necessary to repeal any portion of the section referred to. The responsibility for the control of this expenditure would rest with the local education authority, who would be subject to audit in the manner provided. He would, however, look into the matter before the repealing clauses were reached.

MR. M'KENNA moved to insert after "have" in the Amendment, the word "sole," in order that it might be perfectly clear that the local authority should have sole control. Under the Bill the control of expenditure was in the hands of the managers, and but for this Amendment would remain exclusively in their hands. There was such a thing as joint control, and his contention was that the managers should have no control whatever over a single penny of public money. As the Bill stood the managers had sole control over the expenditure. The relations — whether of dependence or semi-dependence—between the managers and the local authority were nowhere defined. By sub-Clause (*c*) of Clause 8, the consent of the local education authority was required to the appointment of teachers. That meant, if anything, that the managers had the appointment of teachers.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The remarks of the hon. Member do not seem to be relevant to the Amendment. The Amendment is simply the difference between "control" and "sole control."

MR. M'KENNA said the relevancy was that if the managers had the sole control over the appointment and payment of teachers they had the sole control over the expenditure. The Amendment was to give the control to the local authority. But that would not take away the control of the managers. His point was that managers should have no control at all. From beginning to end there was no power given in the Bill to the managers to appoint the teachers, but it was obviously assumed by the words of sub-Clause (*c*) of Section 8. That was the only possible construction of the Section. Consequently, the control of the expenditure was in the hands of the managers, and it was not altered by giving a concurrent control to the local authority. The insertion of the word "sole" was therefore necessary.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

> "After the first word 'the,' to insert the word 'sole.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'sole' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said there was not a single syllable in the whole Bill giving the managers any control whatever over expenditure. The hon. Member had read a sub-Section dealing with the functions of the managers, but the question with which the Amendment dealt was that of expenditure.

Mr. M'KENNA pointed out that he was really continuing an argument which he began on the previous Friday. The existing voluntary school managers had control over expenditure, and he had argued all along that it was assumed that the raw voluntary school managers would have the same control as the old managers had had, subject to such reductions as were contained in Clause 8.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said that that was what he denied. The use of the word "sole" would lead to the supposition that its insertion was for the purpose of freeing the local education authority from any conditions or restrictions as to expenditure imposed by the Board of Education, whereas it was intended, of course, that the authority should be subject to the general law.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said the argument seemed to be that the whole of the expenditure was not to be at the disposal of the education authority ("No.") The Attorney General had said they were to be subject to restrictions.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: What I said was that they would be subject to such general restrictions as by statute are imposed with reference to expenditure.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Then the expenditure is controlled by the Education Department at Whitehall?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: Subject to the general law.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT asked what then was the general law? The Councils would be very anxious to know the law that was to restrain them from dealing with their own money. The Attorney General had opened a very large question, and before they proceeded further the Committee were entitled to know what these restrictions were. They ought to know what the general law was by which the Government, through the Education Department, would govern the local authority in the expenditure of money from the rate. They could not pass that over as an insignificant thing. He did not know, and, with great respect, he did not think the Attorney General knew, what those powers were. Perhaps the Attorney General would be good enough to say what they were and lay them on the Table.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said that the point made by his hon. friend in favour of the Amendment had not been met. The Government contended that the whole of the control of the expenditure, or the sole control, should be vested in the education authority, but his hon. friend said that that was not so under the Bill. The position of the managers was not made clear by the Bill. They could test this in a very simple way. A very important part of the expenditure would be that in regard to the appointment of teachers. He wished to know who would fix the salary of those teachers.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: The local education authority.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS asked, if any claim was made by a schoolmaster, would it be decided by the managers or by the education authority.

Sir W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford): It would be the local education authority. That was a most explicit statement made by the Prime Minister.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said he was quite satisfied with the answer given by the Attorney General.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said he should like the Attorney General to explain this matter a little further, for he could not follow the right hon. Gentleman's objection to the insertion of the word "sole." He instanced the legal control with regard to the Government grants, but the introduction of the word "sole" could not affect Government grants. The right hon. Gentleman did not seem to have any real objection to the word "sole."

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: The accounts must be subject to audit.

Sir CHARLES DILKE pointed out that the words with regard to audit were contained in the Bill itself, and the insertion of the word "sole" could not override them.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Attorney General had made an important statement. He stated that the managers had no powers vested in them except those accorded by this Act.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I said they had no power with regard to expenditure.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE did not see why the Attorney General should discriminate between expenditure and anything else. His hon. friend said the managers had powers invested in them as voluntary managers. He wished to know, were those powers taken away by this Act? If so, then they had no power to appoint teachers.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the Amendment.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was simply taking that as an illustration. The Attorney General said there were no powers vested in these managers except the powers accorded by this Act. He was simply pointing out that under this Act there were no powers to appoint teachers. Therefore, the Government must have it in their minds that the managers refer to something else not in the Act, and he thought they were entitled to know where those powers came from—whether they proposed to put them into a schedule. And how were they to get a definition of the controlling powers of the managers unless they had some words inserted in the Act? Apparently there was something contemplated by the Government which was not in the Act. Where was the law that created the powers of the managers apart from the Bill?

MR. M'KENNA said he thought the Attorney General ought to answer that question.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said this had nothing to do with the Amendment, for they were now dealing with the expenditure only.

MR. M'KENNA contended that they had the same powers over expenditure as over anything else, and the Bill implied that they had powers over the teachers' salaries.

MR. WALLACE asked whether the control could be delegated by the education authority to the managers or not.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the whole responsibility must remain with the local education authority. He did not say that, as a matter of convenience, the petty expenditure might not by arrangement be left in the managers' hands.

DR. MACNAMARA asked if it would be possible for the local authority to draw up their own Budget of expenditure and hand it over to the managers, saying, "Here it is; expend it." Would that be possible under this scheme for a year?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I think the local education authority would need to approve or condemn that expenditure.

(7.23.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 105; Noes, 241. (Division List No. 397.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hon Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman , Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Helme, Norval Watson
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred

Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire
Kitson, Sir James
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hon. J. (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Priestley, Arthur
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York., W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hon J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin, Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fr'd Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E. W. (Bury St. Ed.)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas H.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Hanbury Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick George
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (K'nt, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareh'm
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'rgh, W

Manners, Lord Cecil
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbret Pike (Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormsk'rk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Asht'n und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted." — Debate arising.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

(7.38.) Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 240 Noes, 88. (Division List No. 398.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Butcher, John George
ampbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A (Worc'r
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Reade
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athol
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyney
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt, Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)

Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnston, Heywood
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Manners, Lord Cecil
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter E.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert.
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Shaw-Stewart, H. M. (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chicester)
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G (Oxford Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, William (Gateshead)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Helme, Norval Watson
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Kitson, Sir James
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
M‘Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Priestley, Arthur
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt HnC.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley,George(York.,W.R
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone
and Mr. Wm. M'Arthur.

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put accordingly, and agreed to.

It being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

SERGEANT SULLIVAN, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY — MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

(9.0.) MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork) moved the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the conduct of the Government in Ireland in reference to the charges of forgery, manufacture of outrage, and perjury against Sergeant Sullivan of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and the danger of his absconding." The hon. Member said he would confine himself as far as possible to a plain statement of the facts of this case, and he would earnestly invite the attention of the House to what had occurred. He was quite aware that a very genuine shock was caused to English feeling by the case of Sergeant Sheridan, and that had made it somewhat difficult, perhaps, for Englishmen to believe that two such cases of atrocity could have occurred at the same time and in the same force. It was easy to understand that Englishmen who did not know Dublin Castle should be impressed by the fact that Sergeant Sheridan was for very special reasons disavowed and dismissed from the force, while it was evident from the half-hearted, and, he was afraid he must say shifty, reply of the Chief Secretary this afternoon that Dublin Castle had not yet made up its mind to throw over Sergeant Sullivan, but had been trying even to this day to hush up the matter and retain him in the police force. It was a task of almost incredible difficulty for a private individual to follow up a matter of this sort in the face of official obstruction, but the matter had now been brought to a stage at which he thought any fair-minded person who gave any attention to the facts would find that this charge had not been made without clear and overwhelming evidence. This was a case in many respects of even more gravity than the case of Sergeant Sheridan, because the outrage that was organised in this case was part of a plot against the honour and reputation of the United Irish League and its leaders, a plot of exactly the same character as that of *The Times* forgeries, or the Pigott forgeries, against Mr. Parnell, and he thought it would be made only too evident that the right hon. Gentleman's subordinates in Dublin Castle were saddled with the knowledge of this Sergeant Sullivan's guilt by their own expert in handwriting, and that nevertheless they deliberately, as he would show, packed a jury in Sligo to acquit that man while they were posing as his nominal prosecutors, and paid enormous sums out of the public funds in order to recoup that man for the expense that had been incurred in defending him and shielding him from public justice. More than that, the special urgency of this Motion was this. He was afraid there was only too much reason to apprehend that Sergeant Sullivan might be allowed to flee the country as Sergeant Sheridan, unless the Government were promptly brought to book and made answerable for his appearance.

He would explain in a moment the methods by which they had been up to the present, and he was sorry to say this very day, baffled in attempting to bring this man to justice. A wholly new situation had been now created by the providential disclosure that occurred quite unexpectedly during the recent prosecutions under the Coercion Act in Dublin. The Government called an expert in handwriting, an official of the Local Government Board, named Thomas Patrick Nolan, and in the course of his cross-examination there came out some extraordinary admissions which ought to be read to the House. The witness, under cross-examination by Mr. M'Swinney, said he was not examined on the occasion of the trial of Sullivan at Sligo, and that he thought it necessary to explain that the jury acquitted Sergeant Sullivan without going into the defence, and the suggestion he made to the magistrate was that he was not examined at Sligo simply because there was already an overwhelming case as to the innocence of Sullivan. He was asked "Were you examined?" and he replied "No, there were other ways of availing oneself of my services." Yes, there are ways of propping up perjuries by the *suggestio falsi* which this man did not dare go into the box and pledge himself to. The witness was then pressed as to the conclusion at which he had arrived on the question of handwriting, and eventually he said it was a very awkward question. He thought the House would agree that it was. He was ordered to say whether three or four other experts, including Mr. Gurrin, the Treasury expert, did not differ from his opinion, and he replied they did not, whereupon there was sensation in court. The hon. Member (Mr O'BRIEN) said he was present the whole time in court, and that man did not dare—in spite of the quibble to which the House had been treated at the Table this day—to deny that it was Sergeant Sullivan's handwriting. The House would see that there was a shocking confession by the Government's own expert in handwriting, that he was all along fully convinced of Sergeant Sullivan's guilt, and the attempt that had been made, as far as he could understand by the Chief Secretary in his reply today, to say that Mr. Nolan's swearing that he did not differ from Mr. Gurrin was an evasion. It was an evasion not quite worthy of a great-grandson of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, but it was quite worthy of Dublin Castle. What Mr. Gurrin, the most eminent expert in this kingdom, swore, was that he was so certain that this forged letter was in the handwriting of Sergeant Sullivan that he could scarcely be more certain if he actually saw him write it, and if Mr. Nolan swore he did not differ from Mr. Gurrin, what in Heaven's name is the meaning of this contemptible hair-splitting about words when it is as plain as daylight. He did agree with Mr. Gurrin as to Sullivan's guilt, and the confession was wrung out of him like drops of blood under the threats of the examining magistrate, and only after he had protested piteously did he answer the awkward question. It would be observed that before that admission was got out of him, this expert, Mr. Nolan, swore that although he agreed with Mr. Gurrin that this man was the writer of that forged letter, he was, nevertheless, employed at the Sligo trial, and at the Dublin trial, in order to discredit Mr. Gurrin's evidence, which he heartily believed in himself, and in order to brazen out Sergeant Sullivan's perjured story as to his innocence. What was worst of all, it was now perfectly certain that the right hon. Gentleman's subordinates in Dublin Castle were at this time aware from their own expert that he believed Sergeant Sullivan to be guilty, and, notwithstanding that, the Crown had actually paid this man's fee for bolstering up that lie, and paid the enormous expenses of Sullivan's perjured evidence, and both the perjured policeman and the dishonest expert were to this day retained in the service of the Crown, and sheltered and defended this evening.

He would ask the House's indulgence while he briefly recalled how this transaction arose. It occurred at the time when the United Irish League was just beginning to establish itself strongly in Mayo. At the very outset of this League, which beyond a doubt had succeeded and had been the means of banishing completely and for ever crime from the armoury of agitation in Ireland—this affair was part of a concerted scheme, a diabolical scheme to crush the League by involving it and its leaders in the guilt of a most frightful crime. Some young men were summoned at Westfort for some trivial offence. [Mr. O'Brien was here subjected to some Ministerial interruption, and turning to the Speaker said: I must really appeal against this rude and asinine interruption.] He continued: The local Crown solicitor did a thing which no English prosecutor would ever have dreamt of doing. He went outside the case before the court, and delivered a violent harangue against the leaders of the United Irish League, who were not before the court at all, and threatened in the coarsest language that we should get something that would surprise us. The result of that harangue was that the policemen who were listening to him rushed from the court, and delivered a savage baton charge upon a lot of defenceless people, and in a few days afterwards a large force of extra policemen, under two resident magistrates, was quartered upon the district, at the expense of £1,900 a year to the ratepayers of the district, which neither then nor since has been marked with a single serious crime. This standing army of idlers were simply swarming all over the district. There had to be some justification invented for their presence. The League had, by hook or by crook, to be dragged into some responsibility, and then this Sergeant Sullivan of Mulranny, who was on the list for promotion, thought his time had come. Shortly afterwards an admittedly forged letter was sent to a young country fellow—a powerfully-built, reckless young fellow, who was supposed to be just the material for the thing, and money was enclosed. It purported to come from Mr. John M'Thale, the President of the Westmill United Irish League. The letter instructed this young man, James Kelly, and a party of young men with blackened faces, to go to a house that was named, the house of an unpopular person in the neighbourhood, on a night that was named and commit an outrage. The writer, of course, took it for granted that this young man was acquainted with Mr. M'Thale, who lived only a few miles away, and that he was just the stamp of adventuring young fellow who might easily enough have obeyed instructions. If he had done so, the result would have been a most horrible tragedy, for it turned out afterwards to be the fact that, upon the very night named in the letter, that at the very house named, Sergeant Sullivan of Mulranny, with an armed police patrol, was lying for three hours in ambush behind a fence waiting for his victims. Not only one police patrol, but by some extraordinary coincidence there happened to be concentrated that very night at that very spot a doubly-armed police patrol, and if this young man had turned out he would have been entrapped into a most frightful crime, and the rafters of this House would have rung for many a night with the guilt and with the complicity of myself and every leader of the Irish Party. As it happened, this young man Kelly was not acquainted with Mr. M'Hale, and had never opened his lips to him in his life. He was amazed at getting this letter, and instead of falling into the trap he handed it over to his friends, and the result was that an odious plot was baulked. Sergeant Sullivan and his two police patrols were lying in ambush in vain that night, and the most frightful wrong that ever was done to a political association was averted. Fortunately for the accused, Sullivan had a great many peculiarities about his writing, and the moment that the forged letter and some admitted specimens of his handwriting were submitted to the Treasury expert in London, he came to the conclusion that they were in the same handwriting. This gentleman, who was the confidential adviser of the Treasury and the Post Office in all the most weighty of their affairs, staked his reputation on the statement that he could not have been a bit more sure that the letter was written by Sergeant Sullivan if he had actually seen him write it.

Then came the difficulty of bringing this man to justice in the face of such a combination as that of the policeman's superior officers, Dublin Castle, and the magistrates. For a long time it seemed absolutely hopeless to try to get at him. They first applied to the local magistrates to report informations against him, but the local magistrates, being the local landlords and the sworn enemies of the League, instantly and ostentatiously took his side, and not only refused the informations, but Lord Sligo, the magistrate who presided, actually got hold of the forged letter and refused to give it up. It was only when their counsel, The Macdermott, a former Attorney General, threatened him with instant proceedings in the Court of King's Bench that the letter was given up, and, but for that, their last chance would have been destroyed of bringing this miscreant to justice. On the hearing of the case before the magistrate, the police patrol book was produced. It purported to show that Sergeant Sullivan and his police patrol had been lying in ambush from 10 to 11 p.m. on that night. One of the policemen in the Mulranny Barracks named

Curtain, who up to that time had not in any way, directly or indirectly, interfered in the case, saw this statement reported in next day's papers. He had seen the police patrol book only a few days before, and he was amazed at the statement, for he remembered that what he saw in the police patrol book was, that they lay in ambush from 10 p.m. to 1 a.m. He went again to the police patrol book, and found that a most vital alteration had been made during the few days which had elapsed since he formerly saw it—that was to say, since the prosecution was instituted. The alteration made it appear that the ambush had lasted from 10 to 11 p.m., instead of, as it originally stood, from 10 p.m. to 1 a.m. With a courage that did him honour, Constable Curtain, feeling that a shameful attempt had been made to mutilate the police record, and in view of the most frightful charge, reported the matter to his superior officer, District Inspector Oulton. The officer treated him with the utmost rudeness and brutality. He told this poor constable to mind his own business. When the policeman went back that night to his barrack at Mulranny, he was told by Sergeant Sullivan, the incriminated man, that he was to be removed to the desolate island of Inishkea, twelve miles from the mainland. This was the spirit that created Sergeant Sullivans.

What happened after this? This Constable Curtain was punished by being sent to that wild island, boycotted, and eventually tortured out of the force, for they did not dare to dismiss him, there not being a black mark against him. He thought it his duty to communicate to the prosecution this vital alteration which had been made in the police book. The consequence was that they were able to send up an indictment to the Grand Jury. In the face of this evidence even the Grand Jury of landlords of County Mayo were obliged to return Sullivan for trial. One would suppose that at this day, at all events, the Castle officials would restrain their partisanship towards a man committed for trial for this appalling crime, and as to whom everybody, of course, knew that he could only be brought to justice by fairness and determination on the part of police officers. They might have been expected to steer an even keel, at all events, and to make the truth known whatever the consequences might be. What happened? The very man who stepped forward and offered himself as bail for Sergeant Sullivan was County Inspector Milling, the principal police officer in the county. The other bail was Sergeant Sullivan's superior officer, District Inspector Oulton, of Newport, who had rebuked and upbraided Curtain for his indiscreet conscientiousness in divulging the mutilation of the police record. Of course Sergeant Sullivan was liberated, and a national defence fund was raised, every police barrack in the country contributing. There was a furious agitation among the police instituted, and it might have cost some of those connected with the prosecution their lives. They showed unbridled ferocity towards them, and it was in an atmosphere of that kind that the Crown took up the prosecution. The Crown was asked, as a gauge of fair play in so desperately important a matter, to employ The Macdermott, who was engaged in the private prosecution, and who was cognisant of the facts. The Crown was represented by Sir Patrick Coll, the father-in-law of Mr. Malachy Kelly, the Crown solicitor. Sir Patrick Coll insolently declined to allow The Macdermott to have any voice in the prosecution. Sir Patrick Coll instructed his own son-in-law to work up the evidence for the prosecution, and that man spent the greater part of his time in the police barrack with Sergeant Sullivan and his brother policemen. Every witness for the prosecution—he had it from the lips of Mr. Gurrin himself—was treated with a rudeness that left no possible doubt as to what they were to expect at the trial. Sullivan was tried at Sligo Winter Assizes, at which also poor M'Goohan, of whom the House had heard so much, became the innocent victim of Sheridan. In that case there was a miscarriage of justice which the Chief Secretary was now one of the loudest and most penitent to avow and proclaim. The House would remember that in the case of this poor creature the jury was carefully packed to convict. Every Catholic and every Nationalist was ordered to stand aside. Of course the jury packing in that case had its effect. That was one portion of the jury packing operations of the Crown at these assizes. But there was another portion. Having convicted an innocent man, they passed on to acquit a guilty policeman. In the case of Sullivan the jury packing was carefully manipulated by Mr. Malachy Kelly, who was nominally the Crown prosecutor, but who was the prime mover in this. They had the disgusting spectacle of a wholly Protestant, wholly Unionist, and largely Orange jury, sworn in this venue where nine-tenths of the inhabitants were Roman Catholic. The hon. Member was present at the trial at Sligo, and certainly, since the part that "Honest Iago" took in the duel between Othello and Cassio, there never was witnessed a more dishonest or a more revolting performance. The Crown Counsel addressed the jury with their tongues in their cheeks, plainly apologising for the necessity of submitting the case. The Nationalist witnesses were badgered as if they were dogs, with the connivance of the Crown Prosecutor, and, to crown all, the partisanship of this Orange jury was so naked, so ostentatious, that they actually announced their verdict before the evidence of one of the most important witnesses—Police Constable Curtain—had been heard. Mr. Justice Gibson rebuked the jury for this, and ordered them to retire; but subsequently the jury returned with the verdict as had been already stated. This jury, without even calling for witnesses for the defence, insisted upon acquitting Sergeant Sullivan, although they knew now that if the witnesses for the defence had been produced, the first and principal witness, Nolan, expert in handwriting, and official of the Local Government Board, would have been obliged to avow that he agreed with Gurrin that Sergeant Sullivan was the writer of the letter. When the foreman of the jury stated that they had unanimously made up their minds before hearing Constable Curtain, Justice Gibson said he had never heard of such a case. No human being ever before heard of such a thing happening in a civilised community. After Sullivan was acquitted, these men went about Sligo drunk, and insulting all the prosecution witnesses. Some of his friends in Sligo, who were not very nervous people, thought it necessary to accompany him in the train that night, just as the stalwart Minister of Agriculture sidled up to the First Lord of the Treasury the other night when an Irish Member approached him. That was a specimen of the spirit which had been created by Dublin Castle, and of the spirit in which this disgusting bogus prosecution was conducted.

He had forgotten to mention one circumstance as to the perfect network of obstruction caused by all sorts of officials. The Sligo trial had put an end to any chance of bringing this man to trial for a criminal offence. To be quite candid, the expense of all those proceedings was so heavy as to be almost too crushing for him to bear; but the thing was so atrocious, and it seemed so intolerable to let the truth be smothered in that foul way, that a civil action for libel was brought in Dublin. Of course in a civil action in Dublin there could be no hope of packing the jury. On the other hand, the special jurors in the County of Dublin were chiefly Unionists and Protestants, and there could be no hocussing such a jury by the evidence given in the bogus trial in Sligo. The jury heard the case, and the more the facts were sifted the more they were convinced of the truth of the case for the United League. The result was that eleven out of the twelve jurors were firmly convinced of this man's guilt. It was a matter of public notoriety that the universal opinion in the Four Courts, which was not particularly favourable to the Nationalist cause, was that they had proved their case up to the hilt, in spite of the wanton obstruction. When the trial was about to come on in Dublin he received a telegram from his solicitor, stating that for the convenience of counsel, it was intended to apply on the following day for the postponement of the action to the next sitting, unless he wired to the solicitor to the contrary. He instantly telegraphed that on no account was the action to be delayed for a single hour. That telegram was handed in to the telegraph office at Westport, and received by a clerk named Robinson, a friend of Sullivan's, with whom he had been seen drinking the previous night. That telegram was never delivered in Dublin; it was burked, and suppressed. Fortunately, feeling so strongly as he did that any delay would be fatal, in addition to telegraphing he wrote to his solicitor. The suppression of that telegram was brought before the House by his hon. friend, and the only sort of excuse given by the Postmaster General for the disappearance of this vital telegram was that it had failed in transmission on the wires between Westport and Dublin! Did any one ever hear of such an excuse? He had the best proof what a lie it was, for that very day he had sent other telegrams along these failing wires from Westport to Dublin, and every one of them arrived safely. Of course they understood that the failure of transmission on the wires was the desperate invention of an official who desired to shield this man. Again and again they had asked for a public and open investigation into this most dreadful scandal as to the abuse of the telegraph wires, but it was all of no use. Many months afterwards the telegraph clerk Robinson was dismissed from the service on some other pretext, but it had never been admitted that the wires had been rigged in order to shield Sullivan. That was only one of hundreds of specimens of what they had had to go through in this case. There was a regular conspiracy, a sort of freemasonry among the officials in Ireland to make discovery in such a case as this impossible. He did not think it would be denied by the Crown that thousands of pounds of public money had been spent in the defence of this man, both at the bogus trial in Sligo and at the trial at Dublin. It turned out to be a fact that when the Government paid these vast sums for the defence of this man they must have been aware that their own expert in handwriting believed in his heart that Sullivan was guilty, and that he had been forced to the same conclusion as Mr. Gurrin. The evidence of Mr. Nolan proved that while he himself agreed with Mr. Gurrin that this man was a forger, he was employed for the purpose of defeating justice and discrediting Mr. Gurrin's evidence. He knew of no story in the administration of justice more horrible. This perjured policeman and this expert witness were now in the service of the Government, and were honoured, and more or less defended by the Attorney General. In some respects this was, to his thinking, an even more serious case than that of Sergeant Sheridan, because the Chief Secretary had said that when he was convinced of Sheridan's guilt he was dismissed. Undoubtedly, if the Chief Secretary had not done so, the Irish Members would have worn away their lives before they could have convinced the House of Sheridan's guilt. And this was the Government of a country which was so horrified at the miscarriage of justice in the Dreyfus case!

He wanted to know now what the Government were going to do besides shivering at that table. (A laugh.) The laugh was not impressive, but the shivering was impressive. Were the Government going to dismiss this man Sullivan from the force? What were they going to do with the police accomplices? It was stated that, owing to the malfeasance of the Crown, Sullivan could not be prosecuted for forgery, but he could be prosecuted for perjury, and it was known that in twenty-four hours they could make the proof of this man's guilt overwhelming. The real danger at this moment was that when this man read in Ireland the discussion in the House of Commons it was not at all impossible that he might follow Sergeant Sheridan to America, because he knew that they were not going to allow this matter to die. It was so atrocious that at any hazard and at any cost they would not allow this crime to go unexposed. It had been said in the House that they vilified the Royal Irish Constabulary, who were their own countrymen. They had never done anything of the kind. In his own experience nine out of every ten constables were honest and respectable young Irishmen, who were most reluctantly driven by poverty and the absence of a career in their own country to take service against their own countrymen. But, while nine out of every ten were decent and respectable men, the tenth was a thorough ruffian; and it was always the ruffian who was picked out, honoured, and given promotion. The greater the scandal, the more rapid the promotion, and a shield would be thrown over their misdeeds by Dublin Castle. Sheridan was foolish enough to fall out with his superior officer, when he was thrown overboard without mercy. Sergeant Sullivan was championed by his district inspectors, and Dublin Castle held on to him. This was not a twopenny-halfpenny legal question, but a question deeply affecting the whole of Ireland, and he asked the Chief Secretary what he was going to do. Was he going to dismiss Sullivan, or send him out of the country, or give him a compassionate allowance? They would drag the truth of this case out no matter what were the obstacles, or who might have to suffer.

Mr. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.) said he wished to congratulate the hon. Member for Cork on his masterly address, and he hoped that the Motion, which he was proud to second, would be carried. He knew Mr. M'Hale perfectly well, and he was thoroughly satisfied that that young man would rather see his right hand wither from his body than have written that letter. It was quite obvious, where crime was rare, and the people peaceable, and where promotion in the police force was very slow indeed, the temptations to create crimes as a means of securing promotion were very great. If the letter had been delivered to Kelly, to whom it was addressed, possibly that young man would have been shot in cold blood, or he would have been arrested and returned for trial by a packed jury, and it would not have been the fault of Sullivan if evidence had not been forthcoming to convict him. Moveover, the district would have been branded with a suspicion of crime, and the inevitable sequel would have been that Sullivan would have been hailed as an efficient officer who had been successful in the suppression of crime. The Chief Secretary had said that the evidence on which Sergeant Sheridan was dismissed could not have possibly secured a conviction, but the case against Sergeant Sullivan was far stronger, especially as his own expert witness believed in his guilt, and also because of the fact that ten out of twelve Dublin jurors were convinced that he was guilty. Recent developments made it plainer than ever that Sullivan did write the letter, and instead of wearing the uniform of a police officer he should be wearing the garb of a convict. For the last four years he had been Chairman of the County Council of his own county, and one of the districts in which extra police were quartered was the very district in which Sullivan was stationed. Representations were made by Sullivan and his officers to Dublin Castle that that district needed the protection of extra police, and the people were penalised by having to pay for them. No case from the district was ever sent to the assizes; it was a perfectly peaceable district, but, notwithstanding that, the County Council during the first two years of its existence received communications from the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary, calling on it to pay £1,900 a year for extra police to be levied off one of the most poverty-stricken districts in the West of Ireland, and at the same time one of the most peaceful districts. The County Council asked for an inquiry. It pointed out that the district was peaceful, but Dublin Castle turned a deaf ear to its representations. The statistics of the Government showed that there was no crime in the district, yet it was mulcted for the maintenance of an extra police force; and it was only when the County Council threatened to throw on the Government the task of conducting the affairs of the county, and to allow the whole structure of Local Government to tumble to the ground, that the extra force was absorbed into the general force, the district being no longer responsible for its maintenance. So long as it was the policy of the Government to allow men like Sergeant Sullivan to defeat it, how could the Irish people be blamed if they were confirmed in their worst suspicions of the doings of the Royal Irish Constabulary?

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr William O'Brien.*)

(10.23.) The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) said, as nine-tenths or nineteen-twentieths of the speech of the hon. Member for Cork was concerned with matters which took place before his right hon. friend assumed his present position, and were concerned with criminal prosecutions for which he was entirely responsible, it was becoming that he should put the House in possession of the facts, which from the beginning to the end of the hon. Member's oration had been strangely misrepresented. He would not say deliberately misrepresented, because he believed the hon. Member was so possessed of the notion of the iniquity of Sergeant Sullivan——

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: So is your own expert.

Mr. ATKINSON said Mr. O'Brien was so persuaded of the iniquity of every Crown official in Ireland that that must account for his distorted view, and for the way in which he had pursued Sullivan with the most implacable hate, and by methods which, as far at all events as he conceived, were inconsistent with the very rudiments of justice. There was scarcely an hon. Member in the House who would believe that the hon. Member had prosecuted this man and that he had been acquitted. He had sued him civilly in a venue he had himself selected. The action was pending at the present moment. Unless he was greatly mistaken, it still remained on the file.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN : The action is not pending.

MR. ATKINSON said it was on the file of the Court at the present hour, and yet the hon. Member thought it consistent with fair play, with what was just and right, and even decent, to avail himself of his position in the House to vilify the man he failed to convict either before a civil or a criminal Court. The hon. Member said something about the venue in the Court of Dublin. That was his own venue; he selected it himself, and if he were not satisfied with it why did he not ask the Court to change? If the hon. Member thought that the disclosure that has been recently made of the evidence of this man Nolan was sufficient to bring home conviction to any man of the truth and justice of the case he made against this man Sullivan, why did he not go on with the civil action? No, he was too cowardly. [Cries of "Withdraw."]

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I will ask you, sir, whether or not that is a disorderly remark.

*MR. SPEAKER : I could have wished the right hon. Gentleman had expressed himself in more moderate language. At the same time, I am bound to say I did not take it as if he had spoken of the hon. Member as a coward, or else I should have interrupted him. I thought he was speaking rather of the policy and tone of the speech of the hon. Member, which he has a right to characterise.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I fling back the word "coward."

*MR. SPEAKER: I understood the right hon. Gentleman to say he would withdraw that expression.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN : He did not. Let him say it now.

MR. ATKINSON said he would withdraw the word "cowardly," as he had already done; but he would say the hon. Member adopted a course which, at all events, he thought was an unfair course. If, as he contended tonight, he had obtained evidence which must convict this man Sullivan of this charge, why did he not have it further investigated in the Civil Court? It would have been not only fair, but just and right to bring his action to test.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: So I will; but it is your duty.

MR. ATKINSON said that at all events that was the way the matter stood. A criminal action had been tried, and this man has been acquitted. A civil action had been tried for practically the same thing as in the criminal trial. He was accused of promoting outrage by means of a letter. A civil action was brought for libel on that same letter, and the real question in the controversy in both trials was whether he was the writer of the letter or not. But the hon. Member, instead of proceeding with the civil action, preferred to assail this man in this way before this House. What was it the hon. Gentleman asked? He asked that my right hon. friend should try the case again. Could it be demanded in this House that a man who had been once tried before the tribunals of the land and acquitted should be tried again for the same offence? There was no power to try him again. It would be monstrous to try him again for the same offence, even if the verdict given against him was as unsatisfactory as any man who fairly approached the consideration of the case must hold it to be satisfactory. He would not attempt on this occasion to go through that case again, for the House of Commons was the most unsuitable assembly to decide what was the just and fair conclusion from the evidence of a great many witnesses, and a long and complicated cross-examination. He had read the case many times, and read the evidence before the prosecution was instituted; he had read the report of the trial, and he said no man could read that without coming to the conclusion that there was a fair case one way or the other, even on the evidence of the Crown, for a jury to say that this man was guilty or that he was not; either the letter was a concoction or it was not; either he had written it, or somebody else had forged it, and made the charge against him. The jury chose one alternative, and now, because that conclusion was disagreeable to the hon. Member, he assailed the verdict. That was a most iniquitous thing. He would not stop to refer more to the first prosecution were it not that the hon. Member had chosen to make some reflections upon the different persons who were engaged in it. He has made, first of all, a statement that there was what he called jury-packing. The facts were that there were nine jurors set aside by the Crown, and five were challenged by the prisoner. He did not know what religion they were. Hon. Members make statements in the House that so and so was a Protestant and so and so a Roman Catholic, but they must be aware at the time they make them there was no possibility of checking them. At all events, if they were Roman Catholics who were set aside and Protestants who were selected, certainly that was not his fault. He had directed every stage of this prosecution, and he took the precaution of sending a special circular to the Crown Solicitor who had charge of the case, which was to this effect:—

> "As the action of the Crown in this case is likely to be misrepresented, no matter what it may be, I wish particularly to call your attention to the fact that you should examine the panel most carefully, and consult the Crown Solicitor."

[Much interruption from Nationalist Members.]

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Hon. Members should abstain from these long and frequent interruptions. The attack was listened to with extreme courtesy and attention, and I do hope hon. Gentlemen will show the same courtesy to the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. SWIFT MCNEILL (Donegal, S.): It is the local Crown Solicitor to whom the letter was sent.

MR. ATKINSON: Yes, the local Crown Solicitor.

> "I desire, moreover, in this and all other cases in which local prejudice may be excited, or juries influenced by fear, you will do your utmost to secure that a fair and impartial jury shall be empanelled. In that endeavour you will act strictly on the lines of the circular to the Crown Solicitors of the 12th February, 1894, and signed by my predecessor in office, a copy of which, no doubt, you have in your office."

The Crown Rules provided that no man should be set aside on account of his religious belief. Hon. Members would say, of course, he was not sincere in all that—that that was the usual complimentary strain—that he had his tongue in his cheek all the while he was giving that direction; but if he had, why should the Crown Solicitor, who gets that instruction, deliberately, and for no purpose, violate his duty, and set aside men for such reasons? Those were the instructions given, and he had every reason to believe those instructions were carried out. The gentleman who got those instructions was a Roman Catholic, a gentleman of well-known character and position, one of the most respectable solicitors in Ireland, and a gentleman whom all classes in Ireland respected. He sent down to conduct the case the senior Crown Prosecutor in Ireland, who was a colleague of his, and was now a member of the judicial bench in Ireland, and he wound up his speech by saying his instructions were that no favour of any kind was to be shown to this man. He would cite a passage from his speech—

> "This is not a case for sympathy in a court of justice, and the jury should deal out the same justice to the sergeant as they would to the humblest subject of the community."

The hon. Member for Cork said, "All this is a bogus thing," but when it suited him, when he was trying to get the verdict of the jury in Dublin, those who represented him did not say it, because he knew such a thing would be rejected with scorn. Mr. O'Shaughnessy, K.C., was his counsel and, in addressing the jury he said that no one, in the Court or out of it, would for a moment believe Mr. Geo. Wright who was counsel for the Crown in the criminal case ever did anything unworthy of the profession of which he was such a distinguished member, or of himself. Then as to Mr. Malachy Kelly he said that why the Crown solicitor should have been brought into the case he could not understand. They had not in the slightest manner reflected on that gentleman, and as far as he (counsel) was concerned it was wholly unnecessary to defend him.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN said he had great respect for Mr. O'Shaughnessy as a counsel, but he should be as sorry to be bound by Mr. O'Shaughnessy's politics as he was sure Mr. O'Shaughnessy would be to be bound by his.

Mr. ATKINSON said that that was not the point at all. The hon. Member had made aspersions on the Crown counsel of the Crown Solicitor who conducted the previous prosecution, but he knew perfectly well that he dare not state them before any independent and honest tribunal, and his counsel in his presence retracted every one of them.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN said that Mr. O'Shaughnessy was not his counsel. If he identified himself with Mr. M'Hale, because his honour was struck at as well as Mr. M'Hale's, that did not alter the fact that the action was brought by Mr. M'Hale and that he was in no way responsible.

Mr. ATKINSON said the hon. Member now stated that he was not concerned in the action. He would quote from the report of the trial to show the position of the hon. Member. Mr. M'Hale, the president of the local branch of the League, was the prosecutor in the criminal trial and the plaintiff in the criminal action. He was asked "Are you the nominal or the real prosecutor in the case?" "I am not the nominal but the real prosecutor. I may have said that." "Was it true?" "Well no. It was not exactly true, except that I could not fight." Then he was asked by his lordship what he meant by saying he was not the nominal but the real prosecutor and he replied, "I am the real prosecutor in the case because I am the man whose name was forged, but I had no money myself to go on with it." Then he was asked "who did you look to as your paymaster?" and he replied "Mr. O'Brien." [Here, according to the report, Mr. O'Brien interrupted with, "Yes."]

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: There is some mistake there. This is a personal matter, and we ought to have common fair play. I did not open my lips in the whole course of this libel prosecution.

Mr. ATKINSON: Criminal prosecution.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: No, not once. It is a misprint; it must be.

Mr. ATKINSON: I am reading from the shorthand-writer's transcript of the evidence. [Nationalist cries of "Where was it published?" and "A police reporter."]

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I pledge my word I never opened my lips in the Court. [Some Ministerial cries of "Sit down."] I will not sit down, we are fighting in this House against terrific odds. I never opened my lips in the course of that trial, but I have no difficulty whatever in saying now that, rather than see this poor creature crushed under this frightful imputation for want of money, to the best extent of my means, as well as of the local organization's means, we would have done our best to vindicate justice and our own honour.

Mr. ATKINSON said that of course, he accepted the assurance of the hon. Member. The hon. Member would not deny that he financed this man, but why did he not repudiate the disclaimer of his counsel? Why did he not make those statements then, when they could be tested? The jury in the criminal case did not hear the prisoner's defence, and although counsel for the Crown pressed them to reconsider the matter, they said that they were perfectly satisfied that the case was not sustained. Then the civil action went on and the hon. Member said that eleven of the jurors were in his favour. There was no way in which the hon. Member could legally ascertain that. All he knew was that there was a disagreement in the venue selected by the hon. Member himself. Was it right or fair, while the courts were still open to the hon. Member to revive a discussion of events which took place four years ago, and in reference to which a full debate took place more than three years ago? A man named Nolan was apparently employed by Sullivan, for what did not appear clear from the newspaper report of the evidence. He would however assume, if the hon. Member wished it, that he was employed to give evidence as an expert. The executive Government had no control over him, and had nothing to do with him. He was the witness of the accused and was brought down to Sligo, but was not examined because the prisoner's case was not opened. Were the Crown responsible for that? Were the Crown to step in and prevent the accused man from being acquitted? Nolan was also brought to Dublin, but was not examined. He was not responsible, and the executive Government were not responsible for that. Why he was not examined he did not know. Some short time ago Nolan, in answer to a question in Green Street, denied that he delivered any opinion, and the moment he said that the hon. Member for Cork City believed he was brought down to Sligo to commit perjury, though he now admitted that he was willing to swear he did not agree with Mr. Gurrin. The next assumption of the hon. Member was that the Crown knew that the prisoner's expert would confirm the evidence of Mr. Gurrin, and that the Crown brought down this man to swear a falsehood. He could pledge his reputation and his position that, until Nolan was examined in Green Street, he never knew he was employed by Sergeant Sullivan, he never knew what his evidence would be, he knew absolutely nothing about it. It was a monstrous practice, daily resorted to by hon. Members opposite, without one tittle of proof to sustain them, to use their position in the House to bring the most infamous charges against the executive Government. Such charges, made and repeated in that House without proof, were less derogatory to those against whom they were directed than to the men who made them. The employment of The MacDermott as counsel for the prosecution he refused because that gentleman had been counsel against the prisoner in the initial private litigation, and for the Attorney General to brief him would have been for the Crown to take sides. The hon. Member for Cork said that while nine-tenths of the constabulary force were honest men, it was the other tenth—the scoundrels—that secured promotion. The House must see how difficult it would be to organise a police force on those lines. The hon. Member apparently believed that when a charge was brought against a policeman he ought to be hunted to death, and that every man was a low conspirator and a criminal who came forward to obtain for him a fair trial. He would point out that the Crown was bound to pay the expenses of every prisoner who was brought from his own county for trial at the Winter Assizes, and he presumed the hon. Member thought that because the accused was a policeman that rule should be departed from. What would be thought of him and what charges would be brought against him if, instead of holding himself aloof from both parties, he allied himself with one side? The hon. Member asked what course the Government intended to take. That was a matter more for his right hon. friend than for him to answer. But he had no objection to tell the hon. Member, upon his experience as a counsel of some standing, what advice he would give his right hon. friend, and that was that it would be a most monstrous outrage on justice to put a man for a second time on his trial for the same offence for which he had been acquitted.

(11.7.) Mr. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour) said he desired to put one question to the right hon. Gentleman, which would test the *bona fides* of the speech he had just delivered. The right hon. Gentleman stated that he was responsible for the whole proceedings in this case. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman as a man of honour to say whether he had ever compared the forged letter with the admitted handwriting of Sergeant Sullivan.

Mr. ATKINSON said he had seen photographs of both documents.

MR. HARRINGTON said he had compared both, and he had too long an acquaintance with the right hon. Gentleman in his profession to believe for a moment that he would pledge his word that the forged letter was not in Sullivan's handwriting. That was a sufficient answer to all that the right hon. Gentleman had said. Why should it be left in Ireland to a private citizen to vindicate the law? And if Sergeant Sullivan failed before the Dublin jury to get himself acquitted on a charge of forgery, was he to be retained in His Majesty's service!? The right hon. Gentleman dwelt with great force on the fact that the venue chosen by Mr. M'Hale and his counsel was the venue of the court of Dublin. The right hon. Gentleman knew that eleven out of the twelve jurors were in favour of a verdict against Sullivan, and that one juror succeeded in defeating the ends of justice; and yet the right hon. Gentleman rode off in triumph on that, just as if Sullivan had been acquitted. The right hon. Gentleman dwelt on the fact that his hon. friend the Member for Cork had supplied funds in the case. That was after the Crown had been appealed to to take up the case, and after it had been given every facility. It was the duty of the Crown to have the law respected and vindicated, yet it blocked every step in the case.

MR. ATKINSON said that the Crown Solicitor was advised within five hours of the time the prosecution was instituted.

MR. HARRINGTON said he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that prosecutions by a private individual were almost unknown in Ireland. The whole machinery of the law was set in motion by the Government, and it was recognised as their duty to investigate the circumstances and to institute a prosecution. This case was bruited about for months; every policeman knew that the charge was about to be laid; Sullivan's officers knew it; and instead of instituting a prosecution, they used every means in their power to get up a defence for Sullivan. The Chief Secretary went so far as to justify two of his inspectors in giving bail for this man, and asked whether they were to assume that a man was guilty because a charge was alleged against him. No, but not a single case could be cited, among all the innocent people] who had been put on trial, in which the county or district inspector went security for the accused. Among a people so sensitive to injustice as the Irish all the logic of the Attorney General would never move the impression that the whole force of Dublin Castle was behind this man. Why was the person of Sullivan more sacred than that of any other person put upon his trial? He himself was not professionally engaged in this case, but he was in the district at the time defending other prisoners, and under his cross-examination of policemen they admitted, in the presence of their superiors, that a collection was made in the barracks and contributed to the officers for the defence of this man. The mere fact of the false entry in the patrol book was evidence to them that, whether the man was guilty or not, an endeavour was being made to make up a false case for the defence. The Attorney General, although responsible for vindicating the law in Ireland, had never troubled to compare the alleged forged document with the admitted handwriting of Sullivan. Would the Chief Secretary mend the hand of the Attorney-General? The expert employed for the defence had now confessed in open court that he agreed with the other experts that the two handwritings were the same. Surely the fact must force itself upon the attention of the right hon. Gentleman. Here was a man guilty of deliberate incitement to crime and outrage still being maintained by the Government. It was a case the Government was bound to probe to the bottom, and he had sufficient confidence in the Chief Secretary to say that if he took the matter up he would come to the same conclusion that he had.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool; Scotland) said he had paused, hoping the Chief Secretary would rise, and he was quite prepared to give way if the right hon. Gentleman wished to speak.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE LORD LIEUTENANT (MR. WYNDHAM, Dover): If the hon. Member has any fresh arguments to urge or fresh charges to make, it is better that he should speak first; otherwise I am ready to go on. (Mr. T. P. O'Connor giving way, the right hon. Gentleman continued:) Having been directly challenged by the hon. Member for the Harbour Division, and way having been made for me, I rise, although, after listening to the lucid and exhaustive speech of the Attorney-General for Ireland, I am rather in doubt as to the necessity, because a more destructive piece of criticism I have seldom listened to. Nothing of the charge preferred remains, but evidently some hon. Members think something does remain, because the question pointedly put to me is whether I have seen the letter alleged to be forged, and, if not, whether I will compare it with specimens of Sergeant Sullivan's handwriting, and if I think there is similarity between the alleged forged document and authentic pieces of the officer's handwriting, will I do—what? Order a man who has been tried and acquitted, apparently, to be tried again, or if it is impossible, will I act as if the man had been tried and condemned? That is the "definite matter of urgent public importance" we have brought before us. It is definite; it has turned solely upon a charge preferred more than four years ago against a sergeant of the Royal Irish Constabulary. It would have been important if the question had not already been decided, for such an allegation against a public official is always a matter of the gravest importance until the question has been decided one way or the other. Its urgency can only be argued if a new fact has occurred which causes men of ordinary intelligence to hold that the question has not been decided. This matter has been going on for a very long time. With the exception of the alleged new fact, every single argument, every fact, every allegation, every imputation has been trotted out again, again, and again. Just as we are today debating the case four years after it has been decided, so originally the House was asked to debate it while it was pending. The first debate on the case in this House was on 9th August, 1898, after a true bill had been preferred against Sullivan, and when he was awaiting his trial, which did not take place until December 1890.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said that what really occurred on that occasion, was that the Member for East Mayo asked the Chief Secretary not to allow Sullivan to go on with constabulary duty pending his trial.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am glad the hon. Member has reminded me that the hon. Member for East Mayo took part in that debate, because I also read the debate this afternoon, and I was struck by one sentence in the speech of the hon. Member. What the hon. Member for East Mayo said was, "If he is tried and acquitted, then I presume he will return to duty." The presumption was verified. Sullivan was tried and acquitted in 1898, and he returned to duty. Having been tried in December, 1898, a civil action was brought against him in 1899, and this matter was debated in another place in June, 1899, and in the House of Commons on 22nd June, 1899. There have been two trials, two debates in this House, and one debate in another place, and now we are asked to debate it again because a new fact has come to light. What is that new fact? The hon. Member for Cork has read a long extract from the report given by the *Freeman's Journal* of a cross-examination in a recent trial which had nothing to do with Sullivan. I will not go into the evidence which was given under the stress of that cross-examination, because I am perfectly prepared, for the sake of my argument, and for the sake of my argument only, to take the most extreme construction which the hon. Member himself has placed upon it, viz., that an expert witness in handwriting stated that he agreed with two other experts who had given evidence in the original trial, which took place more than four years ago. The jury heard these two experts say that the letter was, in their opinion, written by Sergeant Sullivan in a feigned handwriting, but having heard a great deal of other evidence for the prosecution, and, above all, the cross-examination of the witnesses by Mr. Seymour Bush, acquitted the prisoner without troubling to retire from the box. I will not speculate as to the exact nature of the impression created in the minds of the jury by Mr. Seymour Bush, who dwelt upon the fact that people had been anxious to secure specimens of Sergeant Sullivan's handwriting before the alleged forged letter was sent. That may or may not, in the minds of the jury, have seemed to have some bearing on the matter. Again, Mr. Seymour Bush, in his able cross-examination, elicited the fact that, whereas the two handwriting experts, Mr. Gurrin and Mr. Price, stated that in their opinion the alleged forged letter was written by Sullivan, but in a feigned hand, all the other witnesses said it was written in Sullivan's ordinary handwriting. That discrepancy may have had some effect on the minds of the jury. But why speculate? The jury acquitted the man, and now we are asked to believe that if a third expert in handwriting—and admittedly an expert of not such high standing as Mr. Gurrin—had been produced the jury would have come to an opposite conclusion. I decline to indulge in these hypothetical speculations, and I certainly decline to act as if a man who has been found innocent by his peers had indeed been found guilty because I am told that a third expert in handwriting would have given evidence of the same character as was tendered by the two other experts and disregarded by the jury.

(11.30.) MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said he had hoped that the Chief Secretary, having to his honour helped to expose Sergeant Sheridan, would have hesitated to protect Sergeant Sullivan. What was the position of the Government? Many as had been the heartbreaking Irish debates to which he had listened during the last twenty-two years, none had more filled him with despair than the one just concluding. Sergeant Sheridan admittedly had by perjury sent three innocent men to gaol, but, without any attempt being made to bring him to justice, he had been allowed to escape to America, two of his confederates had received compassionate allowances, and another was still allowed to wear the uniform of the monarch of the country. Now there was the case of Sergeant Sullivan, who, according to the testimony of the highest experts, was guilty of incitement to crime by means of forgery, and yet was retained in the service of the Crown. But, said the right hon. Gentleman, Sullivan had been acquitted. It was a remarkable and sinister coincidence that this man was acquitted at the very same assizes at which M'Goohan, the innocent victim of Sheridan, was convicted. At the same assizes, before the same judge, and by the same kind of jury, Sullivan, the forger, the inciter to crime, was, and with the connivance of the Crown—for he charged them with it—acquitted. The Attorney General was almost indignant because attention had been called to this matter, and asked why the hon. Member did not go on with his case. Had the right hon. Gentleman no duty to the police force under his control? Where there was a *prima facie* case was it a matter for a private individual to take up? Where was the Government? The right hon. Gentleman himself was head of the police, and he should take care of their honour; and yet he made it a reproach that my hon. friend out of his own pocket paid the expenses of this man having his case brought to justice. The Attorney General had had the face to say that he did not know the character and composition of the jury. He thought it was about time he went over to Ireland, for he evidently wanted a little native air. The right hon. Gentleman had almost become an Irish Cockney like himself. As a matter of fact, he believed there were thirteen people told to stand aside.

MR. ATKINSON: No, there were nine.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said there were nine asked to stand aside by the Crown and five by the prisoner. The Crown and the prisoner, however, were quite the same person. He wished to ask was there a single one of the fourteen persons asked to stand aside a Protestant or a Unionist? Since the days of George IV. there never had been such a professionally ignorant person as the right hon. Gentleman. Every one of those who were asked to stand aside was a Nationalist. By the joint action of the bogus prosecutor and of the prisoner, there was a fine, true blue Protestant and Unionist jury empanelled which was as ready to acquit the friend of the Government as to convict a political prisoner. How like this was the Dreyfus case. The jury which tried Sullivan was packed, and they wanted to stop the case in the middle of it before they had heard the chief evidence.

MR. ATKINSON: No, no. They never indicated any opinion of that sort until afterwards, when they stated that they had come to the same conclusion that morning.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: Yes, they had come to that conclusion in the morning, before they had heard the principal witness. It was stated in court that the case was a strong one without the evidence of this witness, but his evidence was a tremendous corroboration. Before the witness, a police constable from the same barracks as Sullivan, gave his evidence, this impartial jury were ready and willing to acquit Sullivan and almost ready to apologise to the prisoner. That was the impartial trial in Sligo which acquitted this man without a stain upon his character. He for his part thought Sullivan guilty because it required so much jury packing to acquit him. The whole thing reminded him of the man who was acquitted after twelve or thirteen convictions had been established against him, and was told by the judge that he might leave the dock without any further stain upon his character. Let them compare that with what took place in England. In one case which happened recently in London, the evidence of a police officer was suspected to be false, and within a few weeks he was tried and convicted. Let them compare that with the state of things in Ireland. If the police in London were menaced every man was ready to give them help, because they knew that the police, as a rule, were an honourable body of men, and if they did anything dishonourable there was the authority of public opinion and of the Government of the day to bring the police immediately to trial and justice. Therefore the policeman in London was regarded as the honourable defender of the liberty of every man. Here was a man whom the Attorney General dared not declare innocent, but he had to fall back upon the verdict of a packed jury. According to the highest expert testimony, this man was guilty of a forged incitement to crime, and yet he was retained in the service of the Crown in Ireland. This ought not to be a Party question, and whatever might be their opinion as to the particular form of government and the particular relations between the two countries, all parties ought to be united in preserving the honour, honesty and integrity of the guardians of the peace in Ireland. And yet the Government were retaining in their service a man whom everybody in Ireland, and some great authorities in England, believed to be guilty of forgery. They had made their appeal and they know how it would be answered and what the verdict would ultimately be, namely, that the right hon. Gentleman would have to confess that Sergeant Sullivan belonged to the same class as Sergeant Sheridan.

(11.48.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 117; Noes, 215. (Division List No. 399.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair

Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burns, John

Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.

Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings

Edwards, Frank
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)

Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fuller, J. M. F.

Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.

Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harrington, Timothy
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.

Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael

Kennedy, Patrick James

Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Govern, T.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John

Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry

O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'rary Mid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shee, James John

Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur

Reckitt, Harold James
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Watler

Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal

Taylor, Theodore Cook
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips

Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.

Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manchr.
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Butcher, John George

Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHnJ A(Worc'r
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, SirJohnCharles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.

Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, SirHoratioD. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas

Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.

Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E. W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald

Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, ArthurHoward(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John(Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)

Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood

Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William

Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Colonel Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth

Macartney, RtHn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Malcolm, Ian
Middlemore, JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William (Antrim, N.
More, RobertJasper(Shropshire
Morgan, DavidJ(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, RtHnA. Graham(Bute
Myers, William Henry

Nicholson, William Graham

O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy

Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Ridley, S. Forde (BethnalGreen)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isleof Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.

Valentia, Viscount

Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H(Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.) commenced to address the House.

It being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed tomorrow.

LAND PURCHASE ACTS (IRELAND) BILL.

On the Motion that the order for the Second Reading of this Bill be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn,

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said it was surprising that the hon. Baronet should have made a Motion like this without giving the House some notice. He thought they were entitled to a statement with regard to the Motion to discharge this Order. He did not know whether Mr. Speaker would take his formal objection, but he respectfully submitted that with regard to a Bill brought in by a Cabinet Minister they were entitled to debate the question upon a Motion discharging the Order. He begged to move that the debate be now adjourned.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot put that. I think the Government are entitled to discharge this Order. It is always done as a matter of course.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said that, with great respect, he thought Mr. Speaker would hardly come to that conclusion if he examined the precedents. He thought it would be found that there were a number of precedents in which speeches had been made upon the discharge of Orders. Upon a matter of this kind he thought they were entitled to a statement from His Majesty's Government, with regard to the measure which was to replace it.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The question cannot be debated. I have known no case of a debate taking place upon a Motion that an Order be discharged.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said that until recent years it had been the custom to have two Motions, firstly that the Order be discharged, and secondly that the Bill be withdrawn. It was only in recent years that they had been put as one Motion. He remembered that at one time they frequently debated Motions of this kind, although he admitted that in recent years the practice had fallen into desuetude. He had frequently debated such Motions himself. In the present state of the Irish Question, and seeing that they were being denied any opportunity of discussing Irish affairs generally, he thought they should be allowed to ask for some explanation from the Chief Secretary as to what were the future intentions of the Government. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman what he intended should take the place of this Bill after the Order had been discharged? Had he any scheme for the future, or were they to go to the Irish people again without knowing the intentions of the Government, and without one word of hope as to what was to be done in the future?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not know whether I shall be in order in replying, Mr. Speaker.

*MR. SPEAKER: My opinion is that this matter cannot be debated, but if the right hon. Gentleman wishes to give an answer to the question put to him by the hon. Member I will not object to his doing so.

MR. WYNDHAM: Some misapprehension might arise if this matter were left where the hon. and learned Member has placed it. I understand that I should be out of order in debating this question. Perhaps I may be allowed to say that, although I was not aware that this matter was going to be raised, I will say that the Motion to ask leave to discharge this Order must throw no other interpretation upon the intentions of the Government in respect to the Land Purchase Acts than might be reasonably inferred from the speeches I have made in this House and out of it during the present year. This Motion arises only from the fact that we are met during an autumn session mainly, and as far as may be exclusively, to conclude the Education Bill. But for the fact that the Education Bill had taken up much more of the time of the House than was originally anticipated I should have had an opportunity of proceeding further with the Bill now before the House than has unfortunately been the case. It is idle now to suppose that this Bill can be passed into law this year in addition to the Education Bill. That being so, we do not wish to leave it on the Order Paper, as by so doing we may give rise to a false impression. But next year, undoubtedly, it will be the principal measure of the session. I shall hope then to bring in what I may properly call the Bill of the session, but, of course, a Bill embodying such modifications and Amendments as I should myself have been most ready to introduce into the present Bill if it had been referred to a Committee. Of course such a Bill, if it is to carry out the views expressed in the speech I made in Belfast in January this year, must be a Bill to facilitate a voluntary arrangement between the parties to assist the landlords in turning the price they may receive to the best account, and to assist the tenants to offer a price which the landlords may accept, without prescribing exactly the terms themselves.

CAPTAIN DONELAN said the Irish Party accepted the withdrawal of the Bill without a tear.

Order for Second Reading discharged; Bill withdrawn.

MERCHANDISE MARKS (PROSECUTIONS) (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) BILL [LORDS].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 21st October, 1902.

The House met at Two of the clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

LONDON UNITED ELECTRIC RAILWAYS BILL [LORDS].

Reported [Parties do not proceed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 12).

Sir Lewis M'Iver reported from the Committee on Group 12 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned until Thursday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: From Stirling; Hurst Brook; Higher Hurst; Kilbarchan; Barrhead; Johnstone; Kelso; Huddersfield; Parkgate; Longwood; Paddock; Great and Little Bolton; Middlesbrough; Rochdale; Smallbridge; Handsworth; Woodhouse; Winnington; Winsford; Tow Law; Barnard Castle; York; Hindley; Epsom; Kirkby Stephen; Langdale; Bradford; Grantham; Harbury; Wood; Boston; Blakey Moor; Wellington; Barrowford; Colne; Walton-le-Dale; Nelson; Sabden; Aspatria; Crewe; Cromer; Sheringham; Tadcaster; Goole; Castleford; Buckhaven; Lochgelly; East Wemyss; Cowdenbeath; Anchor Co-operative Society; Wakefield; Carbrook; Kippax; Bebside; Reading; and Padiham; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: From Crook; Aller; Isle Abbots; Fife; Sheffield; Todmorden; Kirkcaldy; and Wilton; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: From Stirling; Tow Law; Barnard Castle; Ashton-under-Lyne; Hurst Brook; Kilbarchan; Barrhead; Johnstone; Kelso; Bolton; Rochdale; Smallbridge; Malmesbury; Woodhouse; Winsford; Winnington; York; Hindley; Longwood; Huddersfield; Paddock; Waingate; Epsom; Kirkby Stephen; Langdale; Middlesbrough; Grantham; Harbury; Altrincham; Boston; Barrowford; Colne; Nelson; Bebside; Aspatria; Sheffield; Sabdon; Crewe; Sheringham; Cromer; Tadcaster; Kippax; Castleford; Goole; Padiham; Buckhaven; Lochgelly; Cowdenbeath; East Wemyss; London; Walton-le-Dale; Wakefield; Reading; and Wellington; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Worcester; St. Albans; Benson; Southport; and Southampton; to lie upon the Table.

PLUMBERS REGISTRATION BILL.

Petition from West Riding of York, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: From Stirling; Higher Hurst; Hurst Brook; Barrhead; Johnstone; Kilbarchan; Kelso; Parkgate; Paddock; Longwood; Huddersfield; Little Bolton; Rochdale; Smallbridge; Woodhouse; Barnard Castle; Winsford; Winnington; York; Middlesbrough; Hindley; Epsom; Kirkby Stephen; Langdale; Grantham; Bradford; Harbury; Wood Green; Boston; Blakey Moor; Padiham; Barrowford; Colne; Bebside; Nelson; Sabden; Aspatria; Crewe; Sheringham; Tadcaster; Cromer; Goole; Kippax; Castleford; Buckhaven; Lochgelly; Cowdenbeath; Wakefield; East Wemyss; London; Brightside and Carbrook; Walton-le-Dale; Wellington; Reading; and Silsden; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Fulham and Briercliffe; to lie upon the Table.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copies presented, of Five Orders in Council of 11th August, 1902, entitled The Cyprus Courts of Justice Amendment Order, 1902, The Uganda Order in Council, 1902, The British Central Africa Order in Council, 1902, The East Africa Order in Council, 1902, and the Eastern African Protectorates (Court of Appeal) Order in Council, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EXTRADITION ACTS, 1870 TO 1895.

Copy presented, of Order of Council, of 15th September, 1902, giving effect to a declaration, signed 26th June, 1901, supplementary to the Extradition Treaty of 3rd December, 1873, between Great Britain and Austria-Hungary [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Copies presented, of Two Orders in Council of 11th August, 1902, approving Pilotage Bye-laws for the Ports of Cardiff and Waterford respectively [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

WINTER ASSIZES ACTS, 1876 AND 1877.

Copies presented, of Seven Orders in Council of 11th August, 1902, relating to the ensuing Winter Assizes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (CAMBRIDGE).

Copy presented, of Statutes made by the University of Cambridge, and sealed on 27th May, 1902, amending the Statutes of the University [by Act]; to lie upon the the Table, and to be printed. [No. 359.]

SOUTH AFRICAN (TRANSPORTS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 21st April, Sir John Colomb]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 360.]

ARMY (PAY, NON-EFFECTIVE PAY, AND ALLOWANCES).

Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the Army Regulations as to Pay and Allowances sanctioned during the year ended 31st March, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation—Central Fund.

MR. A. K. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon): To ask the President of the Local Government Board, whether he will consider the possibility of establishing a central fund for the receipt of all superannuation deductions, and the payment of all superannuation allowances under the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act, so as to prevent the whole superannuation allowance falling upon the union last employing the officer.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) There would be many difficulties in adopting such a scheme as that suggested, and I cannot at present give any promise to propose legislation to give effect to it; but I will not fail to give careful consideration to the whole subject.

Voluntary School Trust Deeds.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether he will lay upon the Table copies of the precedents of trust deeds for voluntary schools settled by the Education Department under the Revised Code of 1870 and previous codes.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) There is no objection to laying copies of the precedents of trust deeds for voluntary schools referred to in the Question. But it should be clearly understood that it was only in certain cases where building grants were applied for, that the Education Department are aware these trust deeds were employed. Of the existing 14,294 voluntary schools only 5,347 received a building grant. What proportion of these 5,347 schools actually accepted these trust deeds cannot be ascertained. Thus it cannot be concluded with confidence that the trust deeds of any large number of the existing voluntary schools correspond with the particular model deeds which will be laid in response to this Question. I may add in connection with the subject of building grants that a statement, showing the details of all building grants awarded and the regulations under which the awards were made, will be laid on the Table in the course of the next few days.

Postal Servants' Grievances—Suggested Committee.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the recent changes in the administration of the Post Office, he is now prepared to consider the advisability of appointing a Committee of Members of the House of Commons to inquire into the grievances of the postal and telegraph employees.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) This suggestion has already been carefully considered, and I see no reason for departing from the decision which I announced to the House on the 18th April last, on behalf of the Government.†

English Postal Servants in Ireland.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Postmaster-General, whether he can state how many English postal officials have been imported into Ireland within the past twelve months, and whether it is a fact that competent Irish officials were available.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I have no knowledge of the nationality of officers of the Post Office transferred to Ireland during the past twelve months. In every case of promotion the Postmaster-General endeavours to select the best qualified candidate.

Indian Public Works, Railways and Irrigation—Revenue and Expenditure.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India, in view of the fact that £109,700,320 was spent on public works, railways, and irrigation in India between 31st March 1875, and 31st March, 1900, will he state the approximate revenue derived during that period from each of these three sources.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The information will be found in the following Papers which have been presented to Parliament, viz.:—

Parliamentary Paper, No. 172, of 1886, East India, Financial Statement.

Parliamentary Paper, No. 217, of 1894, East India, Income and Expenditure.

Parliamentary Paper, No. 93, of 1902, East India, Income and Expenditure.

Guardship and Naval Training School at Belfast Lough.

SIR JAMES HASLETT (Belfast, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the position of Belfast as a manufacturing city and a recruiting centre for the Army and Navy, he will arrange to have a guardship visit Belfast Lough frequently, and a naval training school for boys established at Belfast Lough.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) Belfast Lough is not considered suitable as a permanent station for a guardship, but ships of war will visit the Lough from time to time when the interests of the naval service permit. A detachment of the home fleet will visit the Lough shortly after the termination of the present cruise. The question of the desirability of creating a training establishment for boys in or near Belfast is under consideration.

Slavery in Island of Pemba.

MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the case of a female slave in the Island of Pemba (named Msichoke), who, on the 9th of August, applied to the Commissioner's Court for her freedom under the Decree of 6th April, 1897, but was refused on the ground that she was claimed by her master (Abderahim bin Rashid) as his concubine under Article V. of the Decree; whether, under that article, a slave owner may retain possession of any one of his female slaves by simply claiming her as a concubine, although the woman expresses her wish to become free, and brings evidence to prove that she has been employed in ordinary domestic and field work, and is not a member of her owner's harem; and whether a slave so refused has the right of appeal under Article VI. of the Decree.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The Committee of the Society of Friends have drawn the attention of His Majesty's Government to the case, and a report has been called for from His Majesty's Acting Agent and Consul General at Zanzibar.

---

† See (4) *Debates* cvi., 731.

Penrhyn Quarry Dispute—Suggested Official Action.

MR. FIELD: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will follow the course adopted by President Rooseveldt respecting the coal strike in America in the case of the Penrhyn quarry dispute.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The circumstances in the case of the Penrhyn quarry dispute are by no means similar to those in America, and I see no prospect that any official intervention would tend to promote a settlement.

Royal Irish Constabulary—Lack of Barrack Accommodation.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, owing to the absence of barrack accommodation, a number of the Royal Irish Constabulary, from the depôt, Phœnix Park, are obliged to find lodgings in apartments rented from the Dublin Artisans' Dwellings Company; and whether it is intended to continue this condition of affairs.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Twenty-four married men are accommodated in the barracks at the depôt. Thirty-three married men reside outside in close proximity to the barracks, the majority of them in houses the property of the company in question. Accommodation cannot be provided at the depôt for these latter men and their families.

Soldiers in Dublin—Lack of Barrack Accommodation.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that owing to the absence of barrack accommodation a number of soldiers stationed in Dublin are at present residing in buildings rented from the Artisans' Dwellings Company, he will consider the necessity of providing barrack accommodation.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Married quarters will be built under the Military Works Loan, which will relieve the existing pressure.

Private Snowling, 2nd Norfolks—Cause of Death.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the assurance conveyed to him by the Hoxne Rural District Council on behalf of their medical officer of health, that the disease of which Private Snowling, of the 2nd Norfolks, died at Fressingfield on the 29th June last, was typhoid fever, and that he was suffering from it at the time of his discharge from hospital at Aldershot, and considering that two other persons contracted the disease from Private Snowling at Fressingfield, he will cause further inquiry to be made into the circumstances of his discharge, with the object of preventing, in the interests of the public health, a repetition of similar incidents.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The hon. Member has apparently been misinformed. Private Snowling was invalided home for secondary syphilis, and was treated in hospital as a convalescent for this disease until he left on sick furlough on 22nd May.

(2.15) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

Barmaids in India and Burma.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, seeing that His Excellency the Viceroy of India has, in response to memorials from the proprietors of liquor bars in Calcutta and Rangoon, rescinded the orders of the local governors of Bengal and Burma, which prohibited the employment of women as barmaids, whether he can state what is the reason for this reversal.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The prohibition in Bengal and Burma has been withdrawn because there were legal difficulties in maintaining it, but an amendment of the law, with the object of placing the legal powers of the local governments in this matter beyond dispute, is contemplated.

Phthisis in the Rand Mines.

MR. CAINE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention has been drawn to the prevalence of miner's phthisis in the Rand Mines, due to the inhalation of fine dust given off from the machine drills; if he is aware that the medical officers of Redruth, Camborne, and other urban and district councils in Cornwall, frequently report the death of returned miners who have contracted this disease while working rock drills in South Africa; and if he will order an inquiry into the matter, with a view to the prevention or abatement of the cause of this disease.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): My attention has been drawn to the matter, and I am in communication with the Governor on the subject.

Colonial Cattle Trade.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether negotiations were entered upon with the various Colonial Premiers during their recent visit to England with respect to the admission of live cattle into this country; and, if so, what arrangements were made with the Premiers respectively of Australia, Canada, and New Zealand on the subject.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The question of the importation of store cattle was not raised, so far as I am aware, by the Governments of Australia or New Zealand. It was discussed between me and the representative of Canada, when I stated that the prohibition was universal, that it extended to the store cattle of all countries alike, and was not regulated by any order of the Board of Agriculture, but was compulsory under an Act passed so recently as 1893. It was then suggested on behalf of the Canadian Government that the period within which cattle arriving at the ports might be slaughtered should be extended from ten days to a longer period. I at once instituted an inquiry into the practicability of this suggestion, the results of which are now under consideration.

Vaccination Exemption Certificates—Case of J. F. Back.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether he is aware that Mr. John F. Back, on recently applying to the Lancaster bench of magistrates for a vaccination exemption certificate under the Conscience Clause was refused, and subsequently summoned before the same bench of magistrates, and committed to prison for one month for not having a certificate of exemption; and, will he consider the expediency of calling for a report on the subject.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): My attention has already been drawn to this case, and I have inquired into the facts; but I do not find sufficient reason for intervention on my part.

Island of Lewis Schools.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that a Circular was issued by the Scottish Education Department several years since to the effect that school children should no longer be required to carry peats with them to school for the purpose of providing the class-rooms with fires, will he state why there are numerous schools in the Island of Lewis where that Circular is disregarded.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): No complaint, with respect to the practice in question, has been addressed to the Department by the parents of any children, but my Lords will communicate with the School Boards, and call their attention to the terms of their Circular of January, 1894.

Kenmare (Kerry) Port.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any applications for assistance under the Marine Works (Ireland) Act have been dealt with, and whether the claims of the port of Kenmare, County Kerry, have been favourably considered, in view of the needs of the port and of the continuation of the service of the Clyde Shipping Company's steamers, which has been secured to ports on the south-west coast of Ireland by the subsidy granted by the Congested Districts Board; and, if not, can he state what further steps should be taken in the matter.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): A number of applications have been received and are at present under consideration.

I stated yesterday in answer to a question of the hon. Member for East Clare, that the Government hope to be in a position to give effect to the provisions of the recent Statute at an early date.

Coercion Prisoners in Tullamore Gaol.

MR. DELANY (Queen's Co., Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any of the men at present confined in Tullamore Gaol under sentences under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act are upon hard labour and required to do menial work; whether they have been placed upon bread and water diet and obliged to exercise in the ring with ordinary prisoners.

MR. WYNDHAM: Three were sentenced to hard labour. One, Mr. Hogan, has been exempted on medical grounds from hard labour, and another, Mr. Lowry, exempted from completing a full task. No prisoners under sentence, except first-class misdemeanants, on application, are entitled to the services of assistants. None of the three are on a bread and water diet. All are in the "star" class, and accordingly are not exercised with habitual criminals. Full particulars will be found in Parliamentary Paper 129 of this Session.

MR. DELANY: But does not the sentence of one month's imprisonment with hard labour involve, under the prison rules, three days on bread and water and fourteen days on a plank bed?

MR. WYNDHAM: It does not oblige bread and water; but if the hon. Member will refer to a copy of the prison rules he will find a full reply to his Question.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Are we to understand that a sentence of hard labour does not imply bread and water for any period?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, if the hon. Member will look at the rules he will find full information.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Is similar treatment imposed on political prisoners in any other civilised country?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. DELANY: Is this a fair way to treat political opponents?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Belfast Disturbances.

MR. DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland if his intention has been called to the scandalous scenes enacted on the Customs House steps, Belfast, on October 19th, which almost culminated in a riot; whether he is taking steps to prevent a repetition of these occurrences; and whether he is aware that these gatherings are condemned by all respectable citizens of Belfast as the outcome of blasphemy and blackguardism which characterise the meetings every Sunday on Government property.

*MR. SPEAKER: These are not phrases which would be admitted on the Question Paper.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have had no report of the occurrences. The Government will, as heretofore, take all the steps which they think are best calculated to preserve the peace in Belfast and other parts of Ireland.

MR. DEVLIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the principal speaker at these meetings has declared that he intends to hold a series of meetings in the coming week? In view of the urgency of the situation will he take steps to have these things prevented?

MR. NANNETTI: (Dublin, Harbour): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the propriety of railing these steps, as has been done in Dublin?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have nothing to add to the answer I have already given. I have said we shall take the steps best calculated to preserve the peace.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Is it not the fact that these meetings, which have been condemned by Protestant clergymen and newspapers, are held on Government property?

[No answer was returned.]

English and Russian Trade with Persia.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government have now any information relative to any agreement between Russia and Persia whereby British and Indian goods imported into Persia are to be unfavourably treated in respect of customs duties; and, if so, can he state generally the effect of such agreement upon those goods, and especially upon cotton manufactures and Indian teas; have His Majesty's Government any information relative to any recent agreement of a similar character between Turkey and Persia; what has been the result of the communications on this subject with the Indian Government which were proceeding on the 8th August last; and, will the correspondence be laid upon the Table of the House.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have to say that, so far as the Government are aware, no agreement between Russia and Persia has yet been concluded. An arrangement has been come to between Turkey and Persia providing for the complete most-favoured-nation treatment in customs matters. As the result of communications with the India Office the opportunity was taken of the presence of the Persian Grand Vizier in this country to represent to His Highness the importance of British commercial interests receiving equitable treatment. There is no correspondence which can be properly laid on the Table of the House at this stage.

Gibraltar Defences.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now say when the Report of the engineer sent to Gibraltar to report on the harbour on the eastern side of the Rock, recommended by the Gibraltar Committee in March, 1901, and whose Report was being drawn up on 6th June last, will be completed, and when it will be presented to this House; and are any steps being taken meantime to diminish the exposure to fire of the works on the western side, pointed out by the Gibraltar Committee and by the military authorities of Gibraltar.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Report to which my hon. friend refers has been received and is already engaging the attention of the Board of Admiralty. Both that and the question of the armament of the forts is receiving, and will receive, the careful attention of the Government.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the Report be published in the course of the present sittings?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not sure, but I will inquire of my noble friend the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the Report is one which could, under any circumstances, be published. If my hon. friend will put a Question to me later on I will answer it. In any case, it cannot be published until we have given it more consideration than we have been able to do up to the present.

Education Bill—Premier's Statements on Clause 8.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when he proposes to place on the Notice Paper the Amendments to Clause 8 of the Education Bill which are needful to bring its provisions into harmony with the statements in his speech at Manchester, on Tuesday, 14th October.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I suppose the hon. Gentleman refers to the statement I made at Manchester that the fundamental policy of the Bill was to give complete control to the education authority in matters affecting secular education, and that we would be glad to consider whether that fundamental policy could be more effectively carried out by amending Clause 8. We have already accepted one Amendment put down in the name of my hon. friend the Member for the Wellington Division of Shropshire dealing with that subject, and we were able to induce the House, with the aid of the closure, to add it to the Bill last night. There may be other Amendments pointing in the same direction which we may be able to accept, and, in any case, there is one put down in my own name which would make it absolutely beyond question that the education authority is to be able to deal effectively with all questions of the management of schools so far as secular education is concerned within its area. If the hon. Gentleman refers, as perhaps he also does, to the question of pupil teachers, there is an Amendment down in the name of the Under-Secretary for Education representing the views of the Government on that subject.

Mr. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley): There is also the question of grouping which will have to be dealt with.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think that grouping could be dealt with in Clause 8, and, in any case, though it is important, I am glad to admit it is not a subject which I touched upon at Manchester.

Martial Law Commission.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will state when it is expected that the House will be in possession of the Report of the Lord Chief Justice, as head of the Commission recently sent to South Africa to review the sentences inflicted by the Martial Law Courts in that country.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Report has not yet been received. I am not, therefore, in a position to make any statement on the subject.

The Dardanelles.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government have any information with regard to the statement made by Dr. von Koerber, the Premier, in the Lower House of the Austrian Reichstag, on Thursday last, that it is proposed to settle the question of the Dardanelles by arbitration; whether His Majesty's Government have made any inquiries or received any information as to negotiations between Turkey and any other Powers for alterations in the rules and obligations as to the Dardanelles embodied in existing treaties; whether they have any information of negotiations for an arrangement whereby the Dardanelles would be opened to the ingress into and egress from the Black Sea of Russian warships, but would be closed to the warships of other Powers; and whether he is prepared to make any statement of the policy of His Majesty's Government in reference to such an arrangement.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that the reported statement of the Austrian Prime Minister was founded on a telegraphic mistake and that no such statement was, in fact, made by him. In these circumstances, the later Questions of my hon. friend seem to fall to the ground. There are no negotiations going on.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork Co., N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman say what business it is intended to take this evening?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Expiring Laws Amendment Bill, the Patent Law Amendment Bill, and the Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament) Bill.

SOMALILAND.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Has the right hon. Gentleman any further information to give us with regard to events in Somaliland?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I believe no further information has been received.

NEW BILL.

POOR LAW SUPERANNUATION (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

"To provide for superannuation allowances to certain local officers and servants in Ireland, and for contributions towards such allowances by such officers and servants; and to make other relative provisions," presented by Mr. O'Malley, under Standing Order No. 31; supported by Sir James Haslett, Mr. Clancy, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Cogan, Mr. Joyce, and Mr. Harrington; to be read a second time tomorrow, and to be printed. [Bill 298.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

*(2.26) THE CHAIRMAN: The first Amendment on the Paper, that in the name of the hon. Member for Flint Boroughs, has already been provided for by words inserted in Clause 6.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): What words are they which make this Amendment unnecessary?

*THE CHAIRMAN: That part of Clause 6 which says that the local education authority shall have the powers of the School Board under the Act of 1870. One of the powers thus transferred is that of the supplying from time to time such additional school accommodation as may, in their opinion, be necessary.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: May I point out that my Amendment covers considerably more ground. It provides that the local authority shall erect all such schools as may hereafter be required in its area.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Then the point should be raised on Clause 9, which deals with the provision of new schools. The next Amendment on the Paper—that in the name of the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs—is consequential.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) moved an Amendment to the effect that all public elementary schools provided by the local education authority should "be conducted in accordance with the following regulations as to religious worship and religious instruction, namely: (*a*) The school shall open and close with religious worship; (*b*) religious instruction, based upon the reading of the Bible, shall form part of the regular instruction in the school." His reason for moving the Amendment was the belief which existed that the religious education given in the board schools was of an inadequate and altogether unsatisfactory character. As a matter of fact, in the enormous majority of the board schools, religious instruction of an unsectarian kind was given in a most satisfactory way. He wished, therefore, to legalise the present custom in board schools of giving simple, undenominational teaching, which was practically universal, and which was demanded by the great mass of the people. He would like to point out that in the board, Wesleyan, and British schools there were in average attendance a half-million more children than were to be found in the denominational schools—the Church of England, and the Roman Catholic; and so far as he could learn there had been no complaint on the part of the parents of the simple undenominational Christian teaching given in board schools. There were very few School Boards which deliberately abstained from giving any religious instruction; the majority of such Boards were in Wales, and their reason was their belief that religious instruction was not part of the province of the State. He fully sympathised with them, but, in point of fact, the great mass of the people would not be content with that, and required the simple teaching of morality based on the Bible. In our Colonies, and in many schools in the United States, there was the strongest hostility to sectarian teaching. Undoubtedly there was a widespread desire to have religious teaching based on biblical instruction. The theory of purely secular instruction in the schools had broken down. Men and women who were really fond of education, and whose hearts were in the work, could not abstain from giving that elementary teaching which might best be derived from careful instruction in the Old and New Testaments. He moved his Amendment because he could not believe that it was possible for the schools to be carried on without moral and ethical teaching being given in addition to the ordinary subjects of education.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 6, after 'necessary,' insert, 'moreover all schools provided by them shall be conducted in accordance with the following regulations as to religious worship and religious instruction, namely:—

'(*a*) The school shall open and close with religious worship.

'(*b*) Religious instruction, based upon the reading of the Bible, shall form part of the regular instruction in the school.

'(*c*) No person not being a member of the teaching staff employed by the local education authority shall either give religious instruction or conduct religious worship in the school, except with the permission in writing of the local education authority, and under such conditions as the said authority may impose.

'(*d*) No child shall be taken from the school in the hours during which the school is open to any other place for religious worship or religious instruction.' "—(*Mr. Humphreys-Owen.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not know whether the hon. Gentleman was serious in his desire to lay down Parliamentary instruction as to the character of the religious instruction which was to be given in the board schools. It was a rash endeavour, and he certainly would not encourage the House to pursue any such plan. He might remark incidentally that the first provision in the Amendment was in itself a proof of the difficulty which would attend such an effort—the school should open and close, said the hon. Gentleman, " with religious worship." What religious worship? The hon. Gentleman failed to define it. It might be teaching according to the English Church, the Roman Catholic Church, the Mohammedan, the Mormon, or anything which the fancy of the education authority might suggest. He did not know that much was to be gained by a provision of that kind. The hon. Gentleman's Amendment said that religious instruction, based on the reading of the Bible, was to form part of the regular instruction of the school, but his speech was that ethical instruction, based on the Bible, should form part of the instruction. The hon. Gentleman, however, was perfectly aware that what the great body of the people of this country wanted was religious instruction, as distinguished from that instruction which excluded religion, and that it was quite impossible to have religious instruction which did not include some religious dogma. It might not be dogma that separated Christian sects, but it must be dogma that separated Christianity from other religions, or from no religion at all. If the Amendment were adopted they would be starting a controversy in which the hon. Gentleman's own friends and leaders were not with him. In his opinion it was absurd to occupy the time of the children with Bible teaching unless that teaching conveyed religion to them, and he did not advise the Committee to embark on the impossible task of laying down the foundation of a universal Parliamentary theology.

Mr. Humphreys-Owen.

(2.45.) DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said the proposal was, in substance, if not in form, to make it compulsory to give undenominational religious instruction in all schools hitherto known as board schools. He believed that the form of religious instruction given under the Cowper Temple Clause absolutely satisfied 90 per cent. of the working classes of the country. He was thoroughly intimate with it, and his own children had been under it. The syllabuses under it had been prepared by eminent Churchmen in conjunction with eminent Nonconformists, and the scheme had been praised by Bishops and Archbishops.

MR. A J. BALFOUR: I never attacked, or intended to attack, the religious instruction given in board schools.

DR. MACNAMARA said the purport of the Amendment was to make that system compulsory, and all he desired to do was to show how admirable it was. But whilst he personally agreed absolutely as to the desirableness of the Cowper-Temple form of undenominational teaching, he could not help recognizing that there were a great number of people who had very strong conscientious objections to it. He hoped that at this juncture they would be free from deciding on any proposal in regard to religious instruction rather than adopt a scheme which his hon. friend must admit was partial and would have to have added to it a dozen other things before it was complete. He believed that between them they could so agree on such a repeal, not of the essence of the Cowper-Temple Clause, but of the practice under it, as to secure full and free facilities for all those who desired something different for their children. He wanted to meet the views of those who desired something different. There were Amendments on the Paper, such as that standing in the name of the hon. Member for Tunbridge, designed to secure facilities outside the school. That seemed to him to be a suggestion which, given public control of the schools, they could accept. There was no reason under the sun why such facilities should not be given. He hoped that before they concluded these discussions they would come to a working arrangement of that sort, and he appealed to his hon. friend not to press his Amendment, which would fail to secure that liberty in the form of religious instruction which so many parents desired.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said the hon. Member who moved the Amendment in such moderate terms had claimed that there were more children in undenominational than in denominational schools, and had urged that as an argument in favour of his proposal. He did not agree with him, but if the fact were as stated, surely they ought to have some regard to the rights and wishes of the minority. Undoubtedly there were more children in voluntary than in board schools, and he was certain that this proposal would not be acceptable to the great majority of the parents of the children in voluntary schools.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Amendment does not apply to the voluntary schools.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said that fact only strengthened his argument. This was an entirely new departure in educational legislation. It imposed the duty, for the first time, of inquiring into and controlling religious instruction, and he was surprised at such a proposal, coming from the hon. Gentlemen opposite, who always professed a desire to vindicate on every occasion, and in every possible manner, the fullest and freest range of liberty as regarded religious instruction. The hon. Member had cited the example of America, but from what he could gather, the conditions there were not such as to encourage the people of this country to adopt a similar system. The same might be said with regard to Canada. The Amendment would not hold water. It did not meet the difficulties of the case and it would afford no assistance in satisfactorily solving this great controversy.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said it was not necessary to discuss what had occurred in either Canada or the United States. Let them confine their attention to the Amendment, the object of which was to make obligatory by statute a practice which already obtained in the great majority of the board schools. He entirely sympathised with his hon. friend the Member for North Camberwell in desiring to show that board schools could and did give excellent religious instruction; but the proposal of the Amendment was to make religious instruction universal and statutory in all public schools whatever. His hon. friend would no doubt remember that this question caused the greatest difficulty in 1870, when they had a party like the Birmingham League who desired to make public education entirely secular.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): "Where is that party now?"

MR. BRYCE said that there were others who took exactly the opposite view, and after a while, as the discussion went on, the general sentiment of the bulk of the people declared itself to be in favour of trying the experiment of having the instruction—not dogmatic and denominational, but based on the Bible. This general desire, this general opinion of the country, by degrees overpowered both parties in this House, and hence arose a sort of negative compromise, the essence of which was that it did not throw on the State the duty of making provision for denominational education. The only direction which the State gave to the local authorities was that they should not introduce into the schools any formularies. Under that system excellent religious instruction had been given on which his hon. friend had dwelt—a system with which he believed the enormous majority of the laity and the people of this country were content. Why should that system be disturbed and the whole controversy of 1870 re-opened? He hoped that his hon. friend would not press his Amendment. Before he sat down he wished to take the earliest opportunity of referring to an extraordinary statement which fell from the First Lord of the Treasury. That right hon. Gentleman said that it would be absurd to occupy the minds of children with the Bible or Bible instruction except for religious purposes. He was astonished to hear, from the right hon. Gentleman of all men, that the Bible was of no use except for religious purposes. Even if no religious instruction were given from the Bible, he would say that it should hold its place in our schools. The Bible was the only means by which a great number of children in our schools had any access to the ancient world, and the whole immense field of imagination, poetry, thought, and history. He would recommend the right hon. Gentleman—if he indeed meant what his words seemed to convey—to read the preface which Matthew Arnold wrote to his edition of part of the Prophecies of Isaiah, in which he indicated the enormous importance, for the purpose of training children, of giving them some knowledge of the Bible. He was sure that if the First Lord were to read that preface he would come to the conclusion that it would be the greatest pity in the world to exclude the Bible from our schools.

Sir SAMUEL HOARE (Norwich) said he gathered that on both sides there was an agreement that at this time it was not desirable to go further into the religious question; but at the same time they could not ignore the fact that this was one of the many suggested Amendments which had been put before the country, in the Press and at public meetings. For that reason it was desirable that he should say a few words, more especially because the corporation which he had the honour to represent, which had very carefully and very temperately gone into this question, had suggested various modifications on the present Bill, and one of their resolutions was very much in the same words as his hon. friend had put into his Amendment. As to the question of religious worship at the commencement of school work, he, for one, had a strong feeling. If they desired that the children of the Church should be taught according to the tenets of the Church, they also equally desired that the children of parents of other religions should have similar advantages of worship and religious instruction. He was glad to think that in this matter the School Boards had, in the greater number of instances, carried out what, he believed, to be the public demand. But when they came to put an Amendment to the Clause in the Bill, how many difficulties arose as to what kind of worship should be used at the opening of the school work. He was afraid that if the Amendment were adopted the religious controversy would become more and more acute. He wished to support the hon. Member for North Camberwell in his suggestion that facilities should be given to the children to attend the same worship, and receive the same religious education which was in harmony with their parents' religious views. He hoped his hon. friend would not press his Amendment, although he believed that the majority of the House agreed with the views he had expressed.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he could not help regretting that the spirit displayed by the hon. Baronet the Member for Norwich in treating of the religious difficulty, could not also be imported into the sentiment in regard to the denominational schools. At the same time, he trusted that his hon. friend would not press his Amendment to a division, as it did not raise this religious difficulty to a clear issue. It was not a question as to whether they were for or against religious worship or teaching in schools. There were many Members of School Boards who would vote against this Amendment, because they would regard it as a kind of national instruction to every school authority throughout the country. The question was whether they were to give liberty to the local education authority to work out the religious difficulty in their own way? They could not go on giving directions to thirty-five millions of people as to whether they were to worship at the commencement of school, and as to how they were to teach religion. What they should do was to permit a number of people, who were neighbours, to meet together and thrash the thing out as to how and what they should teach the children. His experience was that there was no difficulty when the matter was left in that way. Some hon. friends said that undenominational education was Nonconformist education; but he asked anyone who had really had experience of the working of School Boards whether that was so? Was not a certain syllabus of religious instruction thrashed out round a table? He knew the most Nonconformist valley in all Wales—the Rhondda Valley—

where the rector himself had told him that he had the main hand in drafting the syllabus. In another mining centre where Nonconformists were in an overwhelming preponderance, the rector and two or three curates met the ministers of various denominations and agreed as to the kind of religious instruction which should be given in that district. Not only that, the rector and the curates took their turns with the ministers of other denominations in examining the children on the agreed-upon syllabus. After all, was not that the way to settle this vexed question? This difficulty was not a practical difficulty when the people met in a practical way. But hon. Members would insist on creating artificial difficulties, or in arranging their verdict before they heard anything of the case, or upon arranging the jury in such a way that only one verdict could be given. For his part he trusted the people. He could not quite see the contention of the Prime Minister about separating religion from ethics.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that what he had stated was that while religion implied ethics, ethics did not imply religion. That was surely a common-place.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was not sure but that the highest form of religion was ethics. Any other would be a thug religion. He was very glad to find that the Prime Minister had taken to study Dr. Clifford's utterances. There was some hope that the right hon. Gentleman would be able to understand the Nonconformist case if he studied Dr. Clifford's pamphlets. At any rate, he would find that the Nonconformists did not separate ethics from religion. In America they had tried to settle this difficult problem, and he thought that in the United States religion was much more prosperous than here, from the point of view that they taught the children in the schools, not dogmas, but religion which they could understand. The Prime Minister was raising a false issue here. It was a question as to whether they were going to lay down, as a matter of law, what kind of religious instruction was to be given. He thought if they could not have an agreement in a district as to the particular kind of religion that was to be taught, they had better not teach it at all. Otherwise religious strife was imported, and infinite harm was done to religion if they crammed every child with dogma. Therefore, it was pre-eminently a matter for concord and agreement, and one to be treated in that spirit of religion which hon. Members opposite appeared so anxious to teach the children; but what they insisted was not religion at all, until they could get hold of something they could quarrel about.

(3.15.) MR. WALLACE (Perth) said he would not enter into the discussion which would take place later on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Tunbridge Wells, but if the Committee were to pass the Amendment of his hon. friend they would shut out a great part of that discussion. Personally, he was in complete sympathy with the object of his hon. friend. If he were the dictator and the universal manager of all the schools in England, the system he would devise would be the system laid down in his hon. friend's Amendment. He believed in a simple unsectarian system of religion, especially in teaching children, as he thought they would derive the most advantage from it. But he was not the dictator or the universal manager of the schools; and he recognised that there was a vast number of persons who did not agree with his view of the matter. He sympathised completely with what had been said by his hon. friend the Member for North Camberwell, that if they had their way they would prefer the system set forth in the Amendment; but if they could get complete control of the secular part of the instruction—he meant real and complete control—then they would be prepared to meet their hon. friends opposite and accept the point of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Tunbridge Wells. He believed himself that having regard to the religious differences in the country the only system which could ultimately prevail was an united secular and separate religious instruction—that was to say, that the different denominations should be allowed to teach their own creed to their own children, and that afterwards the children should unite for secular instruction. He did not propose to prolong the discussion on the Amendment, and only wished to say that when the Amendment of the hon. Member for

Tunbridge Wells was reached if, in the meantime, they had got what they were seeking for—control over the secular part of education, which they felt to be absolutely necessary—they would be prepared to support it.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said that although he thought that there were many reasons why it would not be desirable to press the Amendment to a division, he was still glad his hon. friend had taken that opportunity to emphasise the important fact that the prevailing sentiment of the country was in favour of some form of religious instruction in every school in the country. What they were aiming at was to arrive at a state of things which would enable one form of religion to be given in every public elementary school. It was a most unhappy circumstance in the educational life of the country that there should be a want of union in regard to that essential matter in the teaching of little children; but he felt that the Amendment would perhaps be the means of blocking the way to the most excellent settlement of the question proposed by the hon. Member opposite. If ever they did succeed in settling the difficult question of religious instruction, they should beware of doing anything which would stand in the way of coming near that ideal, which would make them, at all events, one in their efforts to teach the spirit of religion, not in discordant tones, but in harmony and union in every school in the country. He felt strongly that every effort should be made to permeate the atmosphere in every school in the spirit of religion, and he was glad the discussion had been the means of showing very clearly that both sides of the House were on that question united n their aim and ideal.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) said his hon. friend might congratulate himself on the discussion which had taken place. He felt, however, that the Amendment should be withdrawn, as that was not the moment to decide the question which it raised. He listened with very great pleasure to the remarks which fell from the hon. Member for Norwich—because he thought, if the Committee considered this matter in the spirit indicated by the hon. Member—they might come to something like an understanding in this matter. They on that side of the House were fighting for popular and complete control over every sixpence spent in the schools which was contributed from public funds, or local funds. If hon. Members opposite would apply their minds to that point, and meet his hon. friends fully and amply in that respect, as he believed the Prime Minister was to a certain extent trying to do, speaking for himself, he would be prepared to meet hon. Members opposite in a like spirit as to denominational teaching. In 1896 he had suggested an exchange of the Cowper-Temple Clause for complete, absolute, popular, universal, control. He did now bind himself to the words he had used in 1896, but given complete absolute and universal control, there would be much less difficulty than some hon. Members thought in dealing with the other matter. He hoped his hon. friend would not press his Amendment to a division and he congratulated him again on the interesting discussion which it had raised.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs) said he did not agree with the Amendment, which would do for Paradise but not for England and Wales. He was a man who believed in religion, and who desired to instruct children above all in religion; but he thought in the present state of affairs they could not give religious instruction in popular schools by Act of Parliament. If they wanted the children taught religion, they must largely rely upon the teaching in the Sunday schools and from ministers of the Gospel, but he held that they would not be able to give the children proper religious instruction in the elementary schools. If they wished to attempt it they would have to see that the teachers were men of piety, and they could not do that. Would hon. Members support a State taught and aided religion in the schools? Parliament was already connected too much in religion by having a State Church, but we have not yet taught all Members of Parliament to be religious. He hoped that Parliament would not connect itself still further with religion by attempting to give State taught religious instruction in the schools. He did not believe Welsh

Members would approve of the Amendment, and he urged the hon. Member for Montgomeryshire to withdraw it. It did not come from a Nonconformist, but from a Churchman; and he held that the hon. Member no more understood the religious feelings of Nonconformists than the Prime Minister.

*Mr. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said that the Amendment called attention to one of the most important and, at the same time, most difficult problems that surrounded the settlement of this great educational question. In the interests of an agreement on the religious question which could only be settled by consent, he merely wished to ask the Government (if it was not too late) to confer with the representatives of the great Nonconformist churches. It was well understood that they had consulted with, and, in some measure, attempted to carry out the wishes of the representatives of the great Anglican Church. On all sides there was a desire—and he agreed both sides were actuated by conviction that some way should be found to secure a settlement and this only could be——

*The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member is speaking at large now. He must confine himself to the Amendment before the Committee.

*Mr. HELME said that the Amendment proposed to secure in all schools teaching of an unsectarian religious character. There was a feeling in the country that that teaching should be universal, and he would content himself with asking the Government if they would take into account the opinions of the Nonconformist churches in regard to the question, without which no real settlement could be arrived at by inviting their representatives to a conference.

Mr. HUMPHREYS-OWEN said he would be best consulting the feelings of the Committee if he acceded to the opinion which had been expressed on both sides and did not press the Amendment. The remarks of the hon. Member for Norwich and the general spirit shown by the Committee gave him much pleasure, and he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

(3.30.) Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said the object of the Amendment which he proposed to move, was to make clear on the face of the Bill the control of the authority, and he proposed to do that by moving to leave out the word "subject" and inserting the words "so long as." The effect of his substitution would be to make compliance with these conditions, in legal language, a condition precedent to the control of these schools and to obtaining the Parliamentary grant. Under section 7 of the Act of 1870, a public elementary school was one that was conducted in accordance with the conditions required to be fulfilled in order to obtain an annual Parliamentary grant, and, taking these Clauses together, if the school did not comply with those conditions, it ceased to be a public elementary school, and the local authority would no longer be required to maintain it. That point was not quite understood even by hon. Members who had made a study of the subject, and the probability was it would not be well understood outside, therefore he submitted that the meaning of the Clause ought to be plain on the face of it. For that reason he desired to put in common language, in words which would be clear to everybody, that if the conditions were not observed, there would be no obligation upon the local authority to maintain the school, and that as far as finances were concerned, the school would be practically closed. He could see no objection to words of that kind, if they carried out the common object they all had in view. He hoped the Government would see their way to accept it. He might observe that the Amendment put down by the hon. Member for North Birmingham as an Amendment to that which he now moved was, in fact, not an Amendment to the Amendment, but raised a different question which could be better treated at a subsequent stage.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 6, to leave out the word 'subject.'"—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'subject' stand part of the Clause."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said the Amendment moved by his hon. friend would have to be taken in conjunction with the subsequent Amendments the hon. Member proposed to move He proposed to leave out the word "subject" and to insert words to make it quite clear that the compliance with the conditions was necessary in order to impose the obligation to support the school upon the local authority. He agreed that the Clause ought to have that effect, and under those circumstances the Government would be prepared to accept the Amendment.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) supported the Amendment proposed, inasmuch as he had an Amendment a little lower down on the Paper which proposed to effect the same object in a different way. The point it was desired to maintain was that the education authority should have a certain amount of control over the managers. Inasmuch as they would have to supply the money, they should have a certain amount of power over the managers. He congratulated the Government on having accepted the Amendment.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said that the discussion that had arisen would show the extraordinary way in which the Bill was drafted. The whole of these words were unnecessary, because it would be seen that the earlier part of the Clause said that the local authority should maintain and keep efficient all elementary schools, and elementary schools were defined by the Act of 1870 to be schools conducted under the conditions necessary to obtain a Parliamentary grant. If a school did not work under those conditions, it would not get its grant, and therefore would cease to be an elementary school. He had an Amendment lower down to leave out all the words from "subject" to the end of the Clause, and he would briefly explain why not only the word "subject" but all the rest of the words should be left out. Clause 8, as it stood, was complete in itself, and any words limiting the powers of the management ought to be incorporated in a new Clause, showing precisely what the powers of the managers should be. The Prime Minister had struck out Clause 7 as it originally appeared in the Bill, and therefore the Committee did not know what the initial duties of the managers were to be; there was no definition of the word "managers," and he submitted that they ought to commence the Clause with a definition of "managers," and that they should put in a sub-Clause which should extend or limit their powers as the case might be. Let hon. Members consider how absurd the Clause would be if this Amendment were accepted. Could any greater nonsense be conceived? If the Clause were allowed to stand as amended it would read—

> "The local education authority shall maintain and keep efficient all elementary schools . . . so long as . . . the consent of the local education authority shall be required to the appointment of teachers."

They had had one badly drafted Act in the Workmen's Compensation Act, and ever since it was passed the Judges had been trying to construe an Act which no one could understand. The drafting of the present Bill was even worse than that of the Workmen's Compensation Act. The remainder of the Clause ought to be omitted, a definition of "managers" inserted, and that definition limited in the case of non-provided schools as proposed under the existing Clause.

(3.47.) MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.) said the condition was obviously inapplicable to the present series of provisions, and its inapplicability would be emphasised by the insertion of the words "so long as." The intention was to create a statutory obligation, which would arise only in the event of certain conditions being complied with by the managers. The sub-sections ought to define the conditions, compliance with which was essential to the claim of the managers upon the local authority. But so far from defining those conditions, the sub-sections were general provisions in character, and some were declarations of right. As amended, the Clause would be utterly unintelligible; it was jargon. By sub-section (*b*) the obligation upon the local authority would exist only so long as the authority had the power to inspect the school, and so on. He suggested that while the Clause was in the crucible it should be so amended that it would emerge in an intelligible form.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W., reminded the Committee that Clause 7, as it originally stood, ran—

> " . . . and in the case of schools not so provided, by the persons who are the managers for the purposes of the Elementary Education Acts, 1870 to 1900, and this Act."

That seemed to recognise certain powers given to managers, such as they had under the Act of 1870. But that provision had been struck out of the old Clause 7, and it did not reappear in the new Clause 8. He therefore asked the Attorney-General to state where in the Bill, as now drawn, there was a positive power given to the managers to appoint the teachers? As far as he could see, there was nothing but an inferential statement assuming such a power to exist. The managers no longer had the powers given them under the Act of 1870; there was no power given either to foundation managers or to elected managers other than that given in Clause 8. Some of the sub-sections in that Clause applied only to the foundation managers, others only to the elected managers. The whole plan of the Bill divided the managers into two classes, certain duties being given to one class, and other duties to the other class, but there was no section declaring the powers and duties of the managers as a whole. What were the powers, rights, and duties of the foundation managers which did not belong to the elected managers, and what were those of the elected managers which did not belong to the foundation managers?

The SECRETARY of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Sir William Anson, Oxford University): I do not see where there is any distinction drawn between the functions of the different classes of managers.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Is it anybody except the foundation managers who are to find the money for the repair of the schools? I ask where is the definition of the powers of the managers within this Bill, beyond what we find in Clause 8?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said the question of the right hon. Gentleman seemed to be based upon a complete misconception of the effect of the section. There was no such distinction as the right hon. Gentleman supposed between the functions and duties of the foundation managers and those of the elected managers. The managers were one body, and every condition in the section, so far as the managers had to do anything, would have to be complied with by the managers as a whole. The effect of the section was perfectly clear, and until he heard his concluding remarks he did not appreciate the point of the right hon. Gentleman's question. What he wanted defined were the respective functions of two bodies of managers. All he could say in reply to that was that there were not two bodies. The whole of the managers, foundation and elected, would act jointly, by a majority.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: By a majority on matters concerning secular education?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: On all subjects. The Committee, after a prolonged debate, had determined the composition of the Board of Managers. That having been settled, the managers would act as one body with regard to all subjects relating to management.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: With regard to all subjects, including secular education and religious education?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: With regard to all subjects, including secular education and religious education—of course, as regards secular education, under the control of the local authority. Turning to the complaints as to the drafting, the hon. and learned Member contended that all the sub-sections were perfectly consistent as they stood. As to (*a*), if the managers refused to carry out the directions of the local authority, they would fail to satisfy that condition, and would cease to be entitled to maintenance. The same with (*b*), if the managers refused to allow the local authority to inspect the school, or withdrew their accounts from audit, they would cease to be entitled to maintenance.

MR. LAWSON WALTON: Where are the words "if they refuse?" It is a mere declaration of right to inspect and audit.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY thought there ought really to be a limit to subtlety as applied to construction. The hon. and learned Member would never venture to urge in the courts of which he was so distinguished an ornament that the power of the local authority to inspect did not impose upon the managers the obligation to submit to that inspection. As to sub-Section (*c*), if the managers appointed the teachers without the consent of the local authority, they would not have fulfilled the condition.

MR. M'KENNA asked whether the words should not be "so long as the consent of the local education authority should have been obtained?"

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said it was not in the least necessary. It really required great legal ability to perceive such difficulties, and he complimented his two hon. and learned friends on the skill they had shown in confusing that which was so perfectly plain.

(4.5.) MR. BRYCE said the hon. and learned Member had failed to answer the principal question of his right hon. friend, viz., as to where this fresh grant of powers was made. As to the use of subtlety, they were indebted to the Attorney-General for an admirable display of that quality in twisting sub-Sections (*b*) and (*c*) into the form of conditions. Instead of debating this question at length would it not be simpler for the Government to admit words suitable to positive gifts of power? He suggested that if the Clause read "so long as the following conditions are complied with, and the following provisions observed" it would make no difference to the Bill from the Attorney General's point of view, and the objections as to the drafting would be met.

Question, "That the word 'subject' stand part of the Clause," put and negatived.

Amendment proposed, after the last Amendment, to insert the words "so long as.'—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'so long as,' be there inserted."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT pressed for a statement as to where the words were to be found by which the managers were given the positive right to appoint the teachers.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: It is clearly implied. If we say that the consent of the local authority should be required to the appointment of the teachers, who else by any possibility can appoint except the managers?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Education Department.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE, on a point of order, submitted that the important question of the relations of the managers to the local authority, involved in the Amendment, could more properly be discussed on a proposal of which notice had been given by the hon. Member for the Morley Division. He therefore asked whether that Amendment would be in order, because, if not, the question would have to be discussed now.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) thought the question of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire, and the reply thereto of the Attorney General, had opened up a very wide field of discussion. The hon. and learned Gentleman had declared that the managers were to be one body. He would have thought that to discuss that point on the present Amendment was out of order, but in any case the question would arise on the first words of sub-Clause (*a*).

* THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the relations of the managers to the local authority could very properly be discussed on sub-clause (*a*) which dealt with that very matter.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: That condition refers only to the non-provided schools.

* THE CHAIRMAN: All that follows after "subject" refers to the case of schools not provided by the local authority.

With regard to the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Morley Division, the provisions referred to are already included in the Bill.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said they might be included, so far as the provided schools were concerned, but not in regard to the schools not provided. It was really a very important point.

Sir FRANCIS POWELL, speaking as a layman, thought that sub-Section 3 of Clause 18 would include the word "managers."

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) submitted that the effect of the Amendment would be to undo the decision of the Committee that the local authority were to have the control of all secular education in public elementary schools, whether provided by them or not. By Clause 13 (2), only the Parliamentary grant of a school maintained by the local authority was to go to that authority, and by the Amendment it would be possible for the managers of a school to refuse to fulfil the conditions of Clause 8, withdraw themselves from the purview of the local education authority, and still receive the Parliamentary grant in respect of their school. If that was the intention it was one to be condemned.

*The CHAIRMAN said that a ruling was given on exactly the same point yesterday.

Mr. YOXALL respectfully begged a ruling on the point now. The Amendment dealt with a matter which was discussed and disposed of yesterday, and he submitted that it was out of order.

*The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I do not quite follow the hon. Member's argument. It is a very simple matter to substitute the words "so long as" for the word "subject."

Mr. M'KENNA thought the Government should accept the Amendment.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said it was desirable it should be perfectly clear that the rights set forth in the sub-Sections were conferred only subject to the performance of certain duties, and for that reason he thought the words should be introduced.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said it appeared on the face of it that the control of expenditure was only to be retained so long as certain conditions were complied with. He would suggest that the Attorney General should consider whether, on report, he could not remove the words "control of expenditure" and make them a condition by themselves.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said he did not think the change proposed by the hon. Member would be an improvement. It would be rather a pity to adopt the suggestion and make control of expenditure a separate Clause.

(4.20.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 262; Noes, 102. (Division List, No. 400.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brigg, John
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. Sir John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Chamberlain,Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb,SirJohnCharlesReady
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox,Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington,Rt.Hon.Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Emmott, Alfred
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants. W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes,Hon.AilwynEdward
Fergusson,RtHonSir J(Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy,Hon.Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS(Warwick,S.W.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary(St Albans)
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene,Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene,W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir William
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.Robert Wm.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harwood George
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hayne, Rt.Hon.Charles Seale-
Hayter,Rt.Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath,Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath,James (Staffords, N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Helme, Norval Watson
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F (Sheffield,Brightside
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(Kent,F'versh'm
Howard,J.(Midd.,Tottenham.
Hozier,Hon.James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys,Rt.Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon.Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col. W. (Salop
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Kitson, Sir James
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,ArthurH(Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,RtHonWalter(Bristol,S.
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macartney,RtHn.W.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Mather, Sir William
Maxwell,RtHnSirHE.(Wigt'n
Middlemore JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott(Hants.)
More, Robt.Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,Rt HnA.Graham(Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharpe
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild,Hon.Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely,Maj J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Seton-Karr. Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H.(Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Thomas,David Alfr'd(Merthyr
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.Sir CEH(Sheffield
Walrond,Rt Hn.SirWilliamH.
Walton,JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby,Lt.-ColA.C.E(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt.Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,George(York,W.R.)
Whiteley,H.(Asht'n-und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley(York,E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood, and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred, (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones William (Carnarvonshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, J A (Glamorg'n, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Hudd'rsf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. M'Kenna and Mr. Yoxall.

(4.35.) MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) moved as an Amendment to Mr. H. Hobhouse's Amendment, at end, to add "in their opinion." This Amendment, he hoped, the Prime Minister would be able to adopt. Its object was to establish equality between the two classes of schools which existed —to make the local education authority the judge, without an appeal to the Central Board, on questions which might arise between itself and the managers of the schools which were now to be given financial support. He believed that the Clause, as it now stood, was very liable, and was sure to place the local authority and the voluntary schools in violent antagonism to each other, and would constitute the Board of Education as the umpire in the conflicts that might arise. These conflicts, he was assured, would arise, and they would be mischievous to education, and that, in the long run, they would be deadly to the Church schools. Why should there be this antagonism? Every dispute that might arise between the local education authority and the managers of the voluntary schools would be referred to the Board of Education for settlement. Now, what did that mean? It meant that whenever the voluntary school managers were backed up by the Board of Education, the managers would be supreme. The local authority was to control the expenditure, but, as he understood it, they would have no power to withhold expenditure—to refuse to finance the voluntary schools. If that were the case the managers of the voluntary schools would have the power of flouting the local authority. Clause 5, which originally gave an option to the local authority, had been withdrawn, and every local authority was, once and for all, forced to maintain the voluntary schools just as they were forced to maintain the board schools. Their control over the board schools was absolute, but their control over the voluntary schools was contingent on being supported by the Board of

Education. Did anyone think that that would be satisfactory to the people? Did any one think that the local authority would submit to that? He did not think so, or that they ought to. Why should a great local authority, representing half a million of people, commit their local liberties into the hands of the Board of Education? The Board of Education had never been the special friends of these great local authorities. The Board of Education had never been specially free itself. It had often been subject to outside influences. This Clause and the two following Clauses appeared to him to be contrivances to belittle and even to derogate the local authorities. He did not want to use offensive words, or to use words in an offensive spirit, but he wanted to say that the aim of those Clauses seemed to reach up to a shameful and odious climax of Clause 9 under which ten ratepayers, who could be picked up at a shilling a piece at any gin palace, would have the right to stay the action of the local authority. That was putting centralisation in its most insulting form. Now, they were told that the Dissenters must pay the rates; that that was their business; but as well might the Bengal tiger be argued with. If the local authority was made contemptible in their own area, and among their own people—if any ten ratepayers who might be minors were to be made equal to the local authority—if managers of the voluntary schools were to be appointed who might not be ratepayers at all—he thought the local authority would not be too much blamed if they struck and declared their own freedom. He frankly thought that it would be very much better if those responsible for the Church schools would trust the local authorities. Why were they afraid of the people? Did they think that the people were against them? If that fear were well-grounded, then the Church had ceased to be national in the full and complete sense of the word. He did not believe that that was so, or that these fears were well-grounded. What did they think of their own form of Christianity being taught in the schools? As long as they believed in their own religion, it would be taught in their schools as efficiently as their belief was deep. But if they ceased to believe in their religion, if it degenerated in their hearts into a half belief, if it was an open question, he did not consider that all the Clauses of this Bill, or any other Bill, would save it from extinction in the schools. It would become a parody and a caricature. He hoped he might receive from the First Lord some indication of sympathy with this Amendment, which would remove some of the public risks and difficulties from his own way.

Amendment proposed, after the last Amendment—

"To insert the words 'in their opinion.'"—(*Mr. Middlemore.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am sorry my hon. friend has thought it necessary to import into this debate the controversial matter with which he has dealt in his speech, but he has appealed for some words of sympathy. If, by sympathy, my hon. friend desires me to express the wish of the Government that the dignity of the local authorities to whom is to be entrusted the whole secular education of the country should be maintained and augmented, he has my heartiest sympathy. My firm belief is that in supposing that this Bill will do anything to diminish the consideration in which those authorities are now justly held my hon. friend is profoundly mistaken. My belief is that this Bill will increase the dignity of the local authorities and induce many of the most public-minded of our citizens to devote themselves to municipal work which at present, for some reason or other, they do not do. Over and over again I have expressed my anxiety that so far as education is concerned the authority of these great bodies should be very great indeed. As regards the Board, no one has ever suggested that, so long as the State makes the great contribution it does towards education, the State, or some Department of the State, should be excluded from some share in the work of seeing that the money is properly expended. Apart from that controversy, I have always desired that the local authorities should have the greatest control. If my hon. friend inquires, I think so far as the financial aspects of the Bill are concerned he will find that much has been done in the way he desires by the Amendment we accepted two nights ago. But my hon. friend explicitly stated that it would be in the power of the voluntary managers to flout the local authority, under Clause 8, as regards the details of management of secular education. I do not think the fears of my hon. friend are well founded, but, lest there should be the smallest mistake about it, if he will look at the White Paper at page 36, he will see an Amendment which stands in my name, in which the Government proposes that—

> "Where the managers of a school fail to carry out any direction of the local education authority under this section as to the secular instruction to be given in the school, that authority shall, in addition to their other powers, have the power themselves to carry out the direction in question, as if they were the managers."

It would be, of course, quite improper to discuss that Amendment now, but, at all events, my hon. friend, after reading that, will, I know, acquit the Government of any desire to constitute the voluntary managers, so far as secular education is concerned, an independent body, who could hold their own in face of a hostile education authority. It must be perfectly clear to my hon. friend that, if this Clause passes in the shape in which the Government desires it to pass, there can be no question as to who it is who has supreme and absolute control in secular education over any and every elementary school in the country. I hope, therefore, that my hon. friend is content and happy in the matter of secular education, but he seems to think the control should go further, and that the voluntary schools should be placed under the control of the local authority—not only so far as secular education is concerned, but also religious instruction. He desires that the religious instruction also should be placed under the control of the education authority. That is not consistent with the policy of the Bill, and it is not a policy which the Government could possibly approve of. The Government frankly and avowedly say that the denominational character of the voluntary schools must be protected. We could not accept any Amendment which would destroy that protection. My hon. friend seems to think that the appeal to the Education Department is without precedent, and that it is an insult to the local authorities. I deny that it is an insult to the local bodies. If it is an insult, then almost all the great Bills giving powers to local authorities convey the same kind of insult, and I really do not see that there is anything to complain of when the Government decides that there should be this appeal. The Education Department is bound to carry out the provisions of the statute, and I really cannot, for the life of me, understand why my hon. friend is so anxious that, in all these matters, the education authority should be the judges in their own cause. If my hon. friend lays down the abstract proposition that the people, meaning the ratepayers, are to have absolutely uncontrolled authority over not only the secular but the religious education in their district, then I am afraid my hon. friend has no alternative but to move an Amendment which would remove the restrictions of the Cowper-Temple Clause.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said that if the education authority was not to be the judge in its own cause, what became of its independence? In other clauses of the Bill they were not even allowed to appoint their own Committee, and, indeed, through the whole Bill they were made subordinate and subject in all respects to the judgment of the Education Department.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Nothing of the kind.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: It was no use denying that sub-Section 2 of this very Clause gave the Department power to determine any question arising under the Section between the authority and the managers. The whole matter was to be referred to the Education Department. Why should they trust the Education Department? They were the authors of this Bill, and it was to them, and the spirit in which the Bill was drawn with reference to denominational schools, that the local authority were to address themselves. The Department was to determine whether the majority of the managers was right, or whether the representatives of the education authority were right. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to an Amendment he had placed upon the White Paper. That could not, of course, be discussed now, but he (Sir William) would just ask whether that was dependent on Clause 8, sub-Section 2, which declared that differences of opinion on school matters should be referred to the Board of Education.

(5.0.) Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not want to anticipate the importance of the debate which the right hon. Gentleman would initiate on sub-Section 2 of the Clause. But the object of that sub-Section was that the Education Department in London should decide any dispute as to demarcation between the powers which were reserved in respect of denominational education by the managers and the powers which were given by the Bill as to secular education under the education authority. The Education Department would have no power to reconsider the decision of the education authorities in the matter of secular education. It had the power to say that it was not secular education at all, but it had not power to overrule the education authority as regarded decisions on matters within the competence of that authority. All that the Bill laid down was the common-sense proposition that if there was a divided jurisdiction there must be some one other than the two powers who should decide the point in dispute.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Then there is a divided jurisdiction?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course there is. Have we ever denied that, as regards religious education, the local authority are not supreme? We have never concealed it. To that extent there is a divided jurisdiction, because there are two kinds of education—religious and secular.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: But sub-Section 2 governs the whole. That has no relation whatever to religious education alone. It refers every question to the Education Department.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Let us wait until we get to sub-Section 2.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said he had no hesitation in saying that he had no confidence whatever in the Education Department to determine these questions. It governed the question of secular education. Any dispute which arose upon the divided jurisdiction was determined by the Education Department as to what was secular education, and if this was so, what became of the authority of the county or borough council? Let the Committee picture to itself what would happen among these managers. There was the standing majority, and then the education authority, which gave certain directions through its representatives. The majority differed from the representatives, and then the dispute as to whether the majority or the representatives of the education authority were right or not was to be determined by the Education Department. The Department was therefore supreme, and the Committee had to consider whether or not, from what they had seen and learnt of the Education Department, it was likely to be favourable to one side or the other. Let the Committee look back on their past experience. Had the Education Department been in favour of School Boards or of the denominational schools? Hon. Members knew perfectly well what had been the animus hitherto, and there was nothing in the Bill which should lead the Committee to have any confidence in the Education Department as the over-ruling authority over the county or borough councils. He agreed with the hon. Member for North Birmingham that it was a humiliating position to place the authorities of Manchester, Leeds, or even Birmingham, under the control of the Education Department in all matters which concerned Clause 8.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: They are under the control of the Local Government Board for many purposes.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: But is that what we mean by decentralisation? There was never such a centralising Bill as this.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is not the case.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said that the same thing was seen in Clause 12. The authorities could not appoint their own committees or make their own schemes; they were subject to the consent of the Education Department. It was a humiliation to treat these great municipal bodies in such a way. In his opinion, there was no reason whatever, from anything they had seen in the administration of the Education Department, which should lead the Committee to give them this authority; and it was necessary to declare that the municipal authorities and their opinions should be those which should govern the education of the country when the Government constituted them as the education authority.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth had constantly expressed distrust of the Board of Education. He asked the right hon. Gentleman upon whom this attack was made. Was it an attack upon a branch of the Civil Service of this country? If it was not that, was it an attack upon the Parliamentary chiefs of that Department? If it was not that, it was an attack upon the Cabinet as a whole. If it was an attack on the Cabinet as a whole, was it not an attack on the House itself? What was the policy of the Board of Education, except that which the House had made it? Complaints had been made, and the House had given its judgment against those complaints. There was no escape from that dilemma. The Education Department was what the House made it, and it was the fault of right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite if they had not more effectively pressed objections in the past. The right hon. Gentleman had found a stumbling block to trusting the people, who had made the House what it was. He was glad that the Government could not assent to this Amendment. If it were passed, it would practically wipe out all the conditions upon which the local authority was to exercise its jurisdiction. It would make it impossible for town councils to exercise their power.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) said that he did not understand the hon. Member for North Birmingham to raise the question of religious or denominational education at all, or any interference with the powers, whether right or wrong, proposed to be given to the Board of Managers in that respect. The Committee were dealing with a sub-section which defined the conditions on which grants were to be made for the maintenance of schools. The Prime Minister said that the Clause defined the demarcation between the powers of the education authority and the managers.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, not at all; what we are trying to do is to get rid of the fallacy which haunts the right hon. Member for West Monmouthshire as to the relation of the Education Department to the general scheme of the Bill. It is not one of the control of secular education at all, but it intervenes to demarcate among other things the boundary between religious and secular education. It does not interfere in the matter of secular education.

SIR HENRY FOWLER said that this was not the question raised by the hon. Member for North Birmingham. The right hon. Gentleman's objection to the Amendment was that it would put the control of the denominational schools in the hands of the education authorities. That was the basis of the right hon. Gentleman's speech, and that was the issue upon which the Committee were going to divide. The issue involved the exercise of powers given by the Bill. There were two questions in which the local authority, according to the opinion of the hon. Member for North Birmingham, should be the final authority to decide, but with respect to which, according to the opinion of the Government, there should be delay and the trouble of appeal to an office in London. Sub-section (*b*) of the Clause said:—

> "The local education authority shall have power to inspect the school, and the accounts of the managers shall be subject to audit by that authority."

Was the local authority competent or incompetent to say "Yes" or "No" where that decision had been arrived at? Then there was sub-Section (*d*), a vital part of the Clause, relating to the keeping of the school in good repair. Did the Government mean that this question should be in every case a subject of appeal? How was the office in London to decide? Were they to send down and inspect the schools? If the local authorities could not be trusted to decide whether the schools were not in a fit state of repair, a slur was cast upon them by allowing appeals from their decision on a simple matter of fact involving no question of principle. The principle that the local authority should have control of secular education—for which the Prime Minister had contended all along—was violated by this appeal to the Board of Education.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Let us wait till we get to sub-Section 2.

SIR HENRY FOWLER said it would be a pity if this point were cumbered with religious controversy which did not arise on this Amendment, and which the hon. Member for North Birmingham did not intend to raise. The question he desired to raise was simply whether the decision of the local authority was to be final on matters of secular education. It was inviting the local education authority to say "We decline to carry on a system in which we shall not be trusted in these small and trivial matters." This was not similar to the control exercised by the Local Government Board. He knew something about the control exercised in this country over such bodies as these. It might be perfectly true so far as Ireland was concerned that the Local Government Board interfered with the administration, but this was unknown in Great Britain in regard to municipalities. All that the Local Government Board interfered with was the borrowing of money. Mr. Gladstone once said that the Local Government Board were the trustees for posterity. This Board, however, ought not to interfere in administrative matters. If Wolverhampton said they would repair their streets in a certain way, no other authority had any right to say "You shall make such improvements, and such you shall not." There was no question of that description arising at all on this Bill. It was simply a straightforward question of administration, and he should support the Amendment.

(5.15.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for bringing back the Committee from a rather wide discussion which perhaps he himself, out of courtesy to the hon. Member for North Birmingham, had perhaps done something—quite unintentionally—to encourage. He was sorry he had done so. He thought the right hon. Gentleman was absolutely right when he said that the matter before them was simply a question of administration. He should be perfectly prepared to fight it out on the single issue as to whether, in respect of sub-Section (*d*) the local authority should be the judge in its own case. They could deal with the other questions later on, but let them now say whether this was right or not right in respect of sub-Section (*d*) which the right hon. Gentleman specially referred to. The Committee knew what his views were, and he was not going to trespass on their attention any further. In the opinion of the Government, it would not be right to allow the local authority, without appeal, to impose any amount of expenditure on the voluntary schools.

SIR JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington) said that the crux of this Bill now was sub-Section 2 of Clause 8, and it was no use providing that there should be full powers if under sub-Section 2 the local education authority had no power to enforce its own recommendations. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider that point.

MR. M'KENNA said that upon this Amendment they had to judge whether the Prime Minister stood by what he said last week at Manchester. He said that the voluntary managers were to be put in a similar position to those under the Act of 1870, but he drew the distinction that the religious powers of the managers should be distinguished from the Act of 1870, and also the appointment of teachers. Outside those two questions the managers appointed under the Act of 1870 would have no appeal to the Board of Education. The right hon. Gentleman said they would have an appeal upon all matters relating to secular instruction. The First Lord of the Treasury had again and again declared that the control of the local education authority was to be absolute on all matters relating to secular instruction. He now said that there was to be a divided jurisdiction. If this Amendment were passed it would not prevent the managers appealing to the Board of Education as to whether the subject was one of secular instruction or not. If the Board of Education decided that it related to religious education, it would be removed from the power of the local education authority. The right hon. Gentleman was now refusing the local education authority absolute control over secular instruction. He had given the managers the power of appeal on matters relating to secular instruction from the local authority to the Board of Education.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Following the example of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton, I would beg hon. Members to confine themselves to the issue whether it is or is not right that there should be an appeal over these various subjects, and especially with regard to sub-Section (*d*).

MR. M'KENNA said these sub-heads related one and all to secular instruction, and if there were any questions outside them the managers could have an appeal as to whether the controversial subject was a matter of secular or religious instruction. By objecting to this Amendment the First Lord of the Treasury was departing from the attitude he took up at Manchester, and was giving a right of appeal on matters of secular instruction. The right hon. Gentleman said it was only reasonable that the State should have control over the local education authority in dealing with the managers, because the State found the money. The Board of Education would always have control over the local education authority, inasmuch as that authority could only get the grant through the Board of Education.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is precisely what I said.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) thought the suggestion of the First Lord of the Treasury that they should devote themselves to sub-Section (*d*), had rather landed them into a contradiction. He would say a word or two upon a different question of policy, which was how far it was desirable that the central authority should have any control over the local authority. The control of the central over the local authority should exist only for the purpose of keeping the local authority up to the full mark of its duties. But the control here proposed was in the direction, not of encouragement, but of restraint. Therefore, on the general ground of policy, it was just bringing in the central authority in the wrong direction. He understood the First Lord of the Treasury answer's was that the Board of Education would only be brought in to decide where the matter in dispute related to religious or secular education, and if the latter, the control of the Board of Education would drop. He understood the First Lord of the Treasury to contend that as far as secular education was concerned no local education authority, however enthusiastic or desirous to proceed, could be in any way curtailed or restrained by the Board of Education under this Section with regard to secular education. The right hon. Gentleman asked the Committee to concentrate attention on sub-Section (*d*). An appeal was given, in the case of sub-Section (*d*), lest the local authority should make too extravagant demands. But supposing the local education authority said that the school buildings and the class rooms were wanted for secular instruction, then, on the contention of the First Lord of the Treasury, the Board of Education would have to stand aside. He would have the Amendment of the hon. Member for North Birmingham accepted as a general proposition, and then, if it was really thought that there was a danger that the local education authority might require expenditure for religious purposes on the buildings, they could introduce the necessary limiting words. His contention was that as a general matter of policy the local education authority would not accept control upon these conditions. These limiting words were required and should be introduced, and he hoped the Committee would accept the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for North Birmingham.

DR. MACNAMARA instanced a case in which the local education authority called upon the managers of a voluntary school to put its buildings into a proper state of repair. He understood that in such a case they would have a right of appeal to the Board of Education if they thought the demands were unreasonable, as the First Lord of the Treasury suggested that the local authorities might be extravagant in their demands. He wished to point out that if extravagant demands were made the local authority would have to find out of their own local funds an alternative building, and that was a check upon extravagance which would be of the most potent character. What was the outlook? The head of the Board of Education was the Marquess of Londonderry. He was now dealing with a point on which a great many appeals would be raised—he referred to the character of the fabric of the schools. Suppose the schools managers said "These demands are too severe; we will appeal to Whitehall." What was the position of the head at Whitehall on this matter? Within the last few days he had delivered himself on this point, and had told the chief inspectors of schools that there was really no need to carry out these building and sanitary laws with anything like precision or rigidity. What were they to contemplate in regard to these matters with a reactionary head at Whitehall? He could only foresee that the same bad old system would continue of allowing insanitary and unsuitable buildings to be used as elementary schools. He thought the Government would do well to leave the local authority to themselves on this matter. He did not think they needed to fear any extravagance, because that would mean that the local authorities would have to build new schools themselves, and he did not think those local authorities would be found tumbling over each other in their desire to erect new school premises. Therefore, having regard to what they might expect from Whitehall, he urgently asked the Committee to accept the words proposed by the hon. Member for North Birmingham.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) contended that there was no such interference with corporations or county councils by the Local Government Board as would arise under this Clause from the Board of Education if it were carried in its present form. Although there were ample precedents for this measure of interference as regarded the treatment which boards of guardians had received, there was, however, no precedent as regarded municipalities. The right hon. Gentleman should consider how far powers of interference had been exercised, and what was the probability of their being exercised. Every local education authority having these powers given to it would have to raise the question of the suitability of the school accommodation in a very large number of voluntary schools, and every hon. Member of the Committee knew that in every one of those cases there would be an appeal to Whitehall. Surely every member of this Committee must in his heart be perfectly aware that difficulties would arise, and by this Clause. Unless these words were put in, they would be handing over the government of the school business in the most essential features from the local education authority to the Board of Education. Therefore, the promise to give the local authority full control disappeared if they carried this Clause without the insertion of these words, for in every important matter that concerned the local authority the control would be transferred to the Education Department at Whitehall. That Department already had the deficiencies of these very schools before it, and it would be called upon to declare that the local authority must take a different view next year to the view which the Department took last year. The whole action of the local authorities would in this way be retarded and checked until the best men would refuse to serve, just as many men refused today to serve on boards of guardians on account of the control over them exercised by the central Government department. He hoped the Committee would insert these words.

(5.40.) MR. LAWSON WALTON said the Prime Minister had invited them to confine their attention to sub-Section (*d*). An issue arose clearly in regard to that sub-Section, and the question was whether the buildings were in a good state of repair. The buildings might not be in a good state of repair in the opinion of the local education authority, but they might be in a good state of repair in the opinion of the managers. That question should be determined by some authority. The question as to whether they should leave the local education authority to determine that issue, or whether the manager should have the right to refer the matter to the Board of Education, was an important one. The issue was very much complicated when they took into consideration, not sub-Section (*d*), but sub-Section (*a*), because there were a number of questions which might arise under that sub-Section, and they must make up their minds whether all these questions, or any of them, were to be subject to the opinion of the Education Department. A dispute might arise, and the contention of the managers might be that they had complied with sub-Section (*a*). There might also be a question whether the managers had carried out the directions given by the education authority. In the next place there might be a question whether those directions came within the sphere of the power of the education authority. Under sub-Section (*a*) there might also be a question of whether the directions of the local education authority were reasonable or unreasonable, arbitrary or capricious. Was that question to be the subject of an appeal or not?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR was understood to say that there was not to be an appeal.

MR. LAWSON WALTON: Then, assuming a direction which is in the sphere of the education authority, it creates an imperative obligation on the managers to carry it out?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. LAWSON WALTON said he hoped, then, that the Prime Minister would reconsider the phraseology of sub-Section 2, and limit the reference by the words, "If a question arises under this section, whether the conditions have been complied with or not." That would exclude the difficulty; but if these words remained in the present wide phraseology, "If any question arises under this Section," it would leave the managers of a school open to complain to the Education Department that they were being kept under the heel of the local education authority, and that they were being subject to the most oppressive and unreasonable directions, and to ask for some relief from that control, when it was not the intention of the First Lord of the Treasury that that should be a question which should be subject to appeal.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said this right of appeal was created for the first time, and was created, not for the purpose of protecting the power of managers over religious instruction, but of fettering the powers of the education authority over secular instruction. It was clear that in everything relating to secular instruction there would be a right of appeal to the Board of Education, and that the arguments the Prime Minister had used in the country were not really founded on the provisions in the Bill. It had been said that the School Boards were incompetent for the work they had to do. They gave no right of appeal against the incompetent bodies at present, but they gave the right of appeal when setting up what were to be the best and most competent bodies to deal with these matters. The important thing was to consider what were the subject matters which might give the right of appeal under the Section. He was going to confine himself to the points in relation to secular instruction. It was perfectly clear in his opinion that in everything relating to secular instruction there was an appeal to the Board of Education in London. If so, and it must be so under sub-Section (*a*), then it was perfectly clear that the contention of the Prime Minister in the country was wholly unfounded, and that the argument he laid before the electorate in order to get them to favour the Bill was an argument not founded on the provisions of the Bill itself. Sub-Section (*a*) was in these terms—

> "The managers of the school shall carry out any directions of the local education authority as to the secular instruction to be given in the school."

That confined the matter to secular subjects, and he thought it must be admitted that, whatever the intentions of the Government might be, every question that arose as to the directions which might be given by the local education authority as to the secular instruction to be given in the school was a question subject to appeal. He wanted to discuss what these subjects might be. Sub-Section (*b*) set forth—

> "The local education authority shall have power to inspect the school, and the accounts of the managers shall be subject to audit by that authority."

That must be the subject of appeal. He did not say that there would be a successful appeal on the matter. There might be great irritation between the local authority on the one hand and the managers on the other, which would have a very detrimental effect on the education of the children. Sub-Section (*c*) said—

> "The consent of the local education authority shall be required to the appointment of teachers, but that consent shall not be withheld except on educational grounds."

That was a case which required great consideration. Supposing the local education authority refused their consent, there was the right of appeal in every case of that description, and the managars could come to the education authority in London. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Hallam Division had posed as a high constitutional authority. He said "Whom are you attacking?" "When you attack the right of appeal," he said, "you are attacking the head of the Education Department." High treason! That was a matter which he desired to hear greatly discussed on the Education Estimates. Personally, if in the House then, he would have something to say on the utter incompetency of the Marquess of Londonderry to be head of the Department. Would the right hon. Gentleman deny that the education authorities in the counties—the combined wisdom of the great County Councils and the great municipal bodies—were rather better than the singular, solitary, and rather doubtful wisdom of the Marquess of Londonderry? Would the right hon. Gentleman go down to Sheffield and say that Lord Londonderry was better able to decide on the matters set forth in the three sub-Sections he had read than the City Council? A few managers of a small school in a small village were to have the right to say "You are not fit to decide; let us put it before this great person at the head of the Education Department." That was a doctrine which the right hon. Gentleman might preach in this House, but it was not a doctrine which he would dare to promulgate before his constituents. Then the right hon. Gentleman came down from the noble Lord to the Secretary who in this House represented the Education Department and said, "You are attacking that gentleman." Were they to be told that the gentleman who was put, for some extraordinary reason or other, into that office was not to be attacked? He might be a convenient person to the Government; he might be less awkward for the Government than the last occupant of the office; he might be able to indulge in perfectly courteous language, and in sonorous sentences which might mean anything or nothing. For some of these reasons, or perhaps all, it might be necessary to put at the head of the Department a nobleman, whose presence made it essential that his subordinate should retire. Were they to say that the hon. Member for the University of Oxford was more competent to decide questions of this kind than the new education authority? The right hon. Gentleman said finally that in attacking this right of appeal, they were attacking the Government. He thought it was the function of everybody in the House, on both sides, to attack the Government. They asked not merely as a matter of right, but of justice, that the Prime Minister in regard to the matters referred to in these sub-Clauses, should at any rate not allow the control of the great county councils to be fettered by the Education Department in London.

(5.57.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 137; Noes, 263. (Division List, No. 401.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry

Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Kemp, George
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Hudd'rsfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Middlemore and Mr. Trevelyan.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hn. Thomas H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fr'd Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue

Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Gordon,Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst,Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Sir.EW(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnL'rdG(Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashfo'd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords,N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry(Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F. (Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir Wm. Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,Jno.(Kent,Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier,Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kennaway,Rt.Hon. SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo.T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macartney,RtHn.W.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,David J(Walthamst'w
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHn.AGraham(Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parker, Gilbert
Pemberton, John S. G.
Penn, John
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James, (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge)
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild,Hon.Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B(Isleof Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,H.C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,Sir MarkJ.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col SirCEH.(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond,Rt Hn SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunt'n
Welby,Sir CharlesG.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams,RtHnJPowell-(Birm.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor,Henry Wilson
Wortley,Rt. Hon.C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther

(6.12) MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W. R., Morley) said that the Clause as it stood did not point out where the powers of the local education authority came from, or what their powers were. He begged to move as an Amendment—

Page 3, line 6, after "subject," insert "to the provision of Section 15 of the Elementary Act, 1870," &c.

*THE CHAIRMAN said if the hon. Member would look at Clause 6, he would see that the Elementary Education Act of 1870 had already been made applicable.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said that that Clause only referred to one class of schools. He wanted to make the Elementary Education Act of 1870 applicable to both classes of schools.

*The CHAIRMAN said that if the Amendment were put in in this place, it would only refer to provided schools, but as under Clause 6 the fifteenth Section of the Elementary Education Act of 1870 was made applicable to provided schools, it was unnecessary to put it in again. I must rule the Amendment of the hon. Member out of order. The next Amendments are chiefly consequential. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Halifax raises the question of renting schools.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) explained that he had put the Amendment down at an early period of the session, and upon the understanding that the First Lord of the Treasury would put one down which had the same object in view, he had withdrawn it. When, however, he found on the reassembling of the House that the right hon. Gentleman had, no doubt through inadvertence, omitted to place his Amendment on the Paper, he (Mr. Whitley) had reinstated it. He now desired to move it formally, in order to discover whether the understanding which had been arrived at between the right hon. Gentleman and himself was to be carried out.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he had to make a personal apology to the hon. Member. It was true that through inadvertence he had not performed his promise. That promise had now, however, been carried out, as the hon. Member would see if he looked at the top of page 25 in the White Paper, where he would find an Amendment in the name of the Secretary to the Education Department, which he thought carried out the object the hon. Member had in view.

Mr. WHITLEY said that under those circumstances he would not move his Amendment, though at the same time he reserved his right to consider the proposed Amendment of the Secretary to the Education Department when the proper time came.

Mr. ALFRED HUTTON said the Amendment he now begged to move was one which proposed, he thought, to carry out the expressed intention of the First Lord of the Treasury to strengthen the power of the local authority. The right hon. Gentleman had stated there could be no question as to the supreme authority; that was the phrase that had been used ever since the Bill was introduced, and the right hon. Gentleman could not complain if the Committee desired that the authority of county councils should be really supreme. He believed there was danger in saying all denominational schools should be maintained if they only complied with these conditions. When more money was required it was only fair that the educational authority should be able to increase its demands. It would be open to the Committee to add conditions when they came to discuss them, but at the same time he thought it right to move that the educational authorities should be allowed to lay down new conditions in future. The authorities were intended to have all these powers in the case of provided schools, and they ought to have them in the non-provided schools. The powers of the managers of the non-provided schools were only inherited powers, and he had never been able to discover how those powers had originally arisen; and if those powers were only derived or inherited, it was important that, as time went on, the authorities should be able to lay down the conditions under which these schools should be managed.

Amendment proposed, after the last Amendment—

"To insert the words 'such conditions as may be required by the local authority including the following.'"—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the Amendment would be absolutely destructive of the Bill. The hon. Gentleman who proposed it must be aware that it was rendered unnecessary by the structure of the Bill. It was an essential part of the measure that the denominational character of denominational schools should be preserved. If the Amendment were adopted a local authority might lay down as one of the conditions that the denominational character of the school should not be maintained—that the teacher must belong to some other denomination than the denomination to which the school belonged. There was no condition so absurd that the local authorities could not lay it down. If the hon. Gentleman replied that they would not lay down absurd conditions he agreed with him, but they would very likely lay down conditions which would absolutely destroy the denominational character of a school—conditions absolutely destructive of the arrangement which the Bill was intended to establish.

SIR EDWARD GREY said that, admitting the contention that the denominational character of the schools must be preserved, he did not think the First Lord of the Treasury was going the right way about to carry out what he had said were his intentions with regard to these conditions. It followed from what he had said that afternoon that, however arbitrary and absurd a condition the local education authority might require, that condition must be carried out by the managers of voluntary schools if it related to secular instruction. He thought the proper way of dealing with the matter would be to give a general uncontrolled power of requiring conditions to the local education authority in this place, and then, when sub-Section 2 was reached, to introduce a provision that if any dispute arose between the local education authority and the managers as to whether a demand of the local authority related either in whole or in part to instruction other than secular, the question should be determined by the Board of Education.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON asked what would happen where it might arise that the arrangements of the management as to furniture, books, and apparatus were interfered with by the Code of the Education Department.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was quite clear that, where the Code and the Act of Parliament came into collision, the Code must give way. The power would rest with the education authorities, and not with the management, as to what were the books which were to be used in the school for secular education.

*SIR WILLIAM MATHER (Lancashire, Rossendale) thought the Amendment raised a very large question which, notwithstanding the assurances of the right hon. Gentleman as to absolute control over secular education, created considerable doubt in the minds of some of the Committee as to how the education authority could be considered to have absolute control over education. They had not heard from the right hon. Gentleman what was to be the characteristic of the denominational school. So far as he could make out, it was to be divided into two compartments—one for secular and the other for denominational teaching. But the managers were to manage the whole school. At the same time, they were told the education authority was to have full control over the schools, so far as secular instruction was concerned. Was such a state of things conceivable in practice? He desired to have a workable Bill, but that was absolutely impossible, unless the right hon. Gentleman would take into consideration the fact that this Clause created two bodies as the school managers. Let them clear the ground, so as to have one real authority for schools provided and not provided, and then face the question of retaining the denominational character of schools in such a manner that it would not encroach on a great public right.

DR. MACNAMARA quite saw the reason why the Government could not accept these words, because they would permit the local education authority to interfere with religious instruction; but perhaps the right hon. Gentleman might be able to introduce, at some subsequent stage, words which would relate entirely to the secular character of the school. The London School Board had had managers for thirty-two years; they had had considerable experience of what was secular education, and they had a large volume on the subject; yet there was not a week passed that the question was not raised as to what was and what was not secular education—the use of the desk, for instance, for both purposes, and the letting the school for public purposes. They sometimes let it for dancing.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I don't think dancing is quite secular education.

DR. MACNAMARA said the right hon. Gentleman had said that all education was either secular or religious, so that if dancing was not secular it must be religious education. He did not press the matter, but he would warn the right hon. Gentleman that if he confined himself to the five specific points set out in this Clause, they would not cover the ground; and unless some words of a general character were introduced, interminable difficulties would arise.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS asked permission to suggest a few simple words which he thought would carry out the intentions of the hon. Member, and, as he understood, would also carry out the intention of the Government. He believed that the difficulty would be got over if they inserted after the word "conditions" in the Amendment the words "not relating solely to religious instruction." He begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the word 'conditions,' to insert the words 'not relating solely to religious instruction.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he thought the hon. Member had made a sincere attempt to amend the Amendment, which, however, was hardly practical. The voluntary school buildings belonged, and would belong after the Bill passed, to the trustees of the school. The education authority would have complete control over the school for the purposes of secular education during school hours. The Government had never suggested carrying out a policy so drastic as that proposed by the hon. Gentleman, which practically took away the school altogether, even during the hours in which secular education was not being carried on.

(6.45.) MR. LAWSON WALTON said that if he followed the Amendment correctly, it simply enacted in another form something that was already in the Bill. It merely turned the phraseology of sub-Clause (*a*), but the Prime Minister was so little familiar with the language of the Clause that he failed to recognise his own offspring, and proceeded to strangle it by describing it as a hostile and destructive Amendment. The proposal was that the local authority should have the right from time to time to make new conditions, subject to which their obligation to maintain the schools should continue, and that those conditions should be limited to the sphere of secular instruction. That was sub-Clause (*a*), because it was there provided that the local authority should have the right to issue directions from time to time to the local managers with regard to secular instruction, and compliance with those directions was a condition of the right of the managers to receive assistance from the local authority.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was glad to have the hon. and learned Gentleman's assent to sub-Section (*a*).

MR. LAWSON WALTON said it was simply a question as to which phraseology should be adopted. If the Prime Minister acknowledged that the Amendment was sub-Section (*a*), there could be no harm in it.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said it was idle for them to pretend that the Amendment did not go beyond sub-Section (*a*). It did go beyond sub-Section (*a*), and they intended it to do so. Among other things, the words covered the right to use the schools for public meetings, and a most important principle was involved.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked whether in the opinion of the Prime Minister under sub-Clause (*a*) the county authority had no authority whatever over the schools, but that their authority was confined purely to the kind of instruction given. It seemed to be the view of the right hon. Gentleman that the county authority could direct the use of a particular book. If that was so, it would require to be made clearer later on. The question he now asked was whether they had any control over the fabric of the school or with regard to the evenings. If not, he failed to see where the control came in.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: They have no control after school hours.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought that was a strong argument in favour of the Amendment. Suppose a county authority wanted the use of a school in the evening for classes or other purposes connected with education, but the managers wanted it for concerts or entertainments connected with the church, who would have the control then? Was that one of the matters to be referred to the Board of Education? Was it the position that although the furniture might belong to the county authority they were to have no control over it after school hours. If so, sub-Clause (*a*) did not go far enough. With regard to books, if the managers declined to accept those selected by the authority, would there be an appeal from the managers to the Board of Education? If so, the control of the county authority was merely nominal, and to speak of them as having the sole or complete control of secular instruction was a perfect farce.

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) desired to enter a *caveat* against a too universal application of the principle that the authority should select the books. It might be extremely offensive if the text-books were in all cases to be the same as prescribed by the local authority. He thought it would be too much to say that the local authority should have the absolute choice of the text-books and the power of imposing them on a denomination.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. Gentleman opposite had asked him whether the local authority was to have any control of the school buildings except for the purposes of secular education. His answer to that was in the negative. The local authority ought not to have the control of buildings which did not belong to them and for which they would not pay. It was right that they should have control over these buildings so far as secular education was concerned, for which they paid and over which they had control, but he saw no reason why they should go beyond that.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked whether the local authority would have command of the schools in the evening for the purposes of secular instruction, lectures, or evening classes.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said if it was part of the elementary system he assumed they would, but he did not wish to answer that question offhand. He was sorry the hon. Member had raised the question about the text-books. He thought the hon. Member must have intended to irritate the religious susceptibilities of those who thought the education authority was capable of using historical books intended only for secular instruction without consulting the convictions of the managers of the schools. For his part, he thought the education authority ought to have the choice of books. He was perfectly convinced that there was no education authority in the country which would behave in such an outrageous manner as that feared by his right hon. friend. He could imagine cases, but he did not believe those cases would arise. He rather deprecated going into all the niceties and subtleties which an ingenious mind might, perhaps, raise on the topic.

DR. MACNAMARA said that this was rather a serious matter. He understood from the Under-Secretary that the local authority would have no control whatever of the buildings outside school hours. Would the managers be able then to use the premises for any purposes they liked, and would they be permitted to leave them in a condition unfit for the resumption of school on the following day?

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said there was one practical matter in connection with this question which he hoped the Government would consider. The evening schools in the country districts, which were now held by the county authorities, were for the most part held in voluntary schools, and he believed in almost every case the voluntary school managers now gave the use of their buildings to the county authority entirely free of charge. These schools so held were not elementary schools at all, they were technical schools in which metal-work, wood-work, and various other kinds of technical instruction was carried on. Whatever was done in the Bill, he had no doubt that in most cases the managers of these schools would continue to allow the county authorities to use them free of charge as evening schools. But he should like the Government to consider whether, as this Bill was now being passed, the county authorities ought not to have some rights. As they had rights to use the schools in the daytime as public elementary schools, ought they not to have some right to use the schools in the evening as technical schools? He was quite aware that the right might not have to be enforced except in very rare cases, still it was for rare cases that provisions were put into Acts of Parliament.

(7.5.) SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said he was glad to hear what had fallen from the hon. Baronet opposite. He hoped the First Lord of the Treasury would give way on this point, because he thought the local authorities ought to have the power to demand these schools for evening classes. In large mining districts, such as he represented, lectures were given in the schools, and instead of this privilege being a favour granted to the locality, he thought the county authority ought to have the right to demand the use of the school for such purposes. He felt sure that unless some such power as this was given a difficulty would arise. He had known more than one case where the whole of the voluntary schools had experienced this difficulty simply out of pique, and the Committee certainly ought to be most particular in giving the local authority a right to use these schools for such purposes. He was pleased to hear what the right hon. Gentleman said with regard to books. He could not see how any authority could have control of secular education unless it could select the books from which the education was given. He hoped his right hon. friend would, at all events, recognise the desire of hon. Members to have some words inserted which would carry out the views which had been expressed upon this point.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said if this question was discussed, they must have regard to all the circumstances. They had not only to deal with English County Councils, but also with Welsh County Councils. He had not the slightest doubt that English County Councils would be quite incapable of using powers given with regard to secular education in order to destroy the religious education. But there was a particular virulence about the Celtic temperament which made no course too unreasonable, or too ill-natured, if he might say so, to be adopted. Therefore, in the case of Welsh County Councils, he thought it possible that they would use both powers, the power over books and the power of using the schools for purposes of technical education, not for any *bonâ fide* purposes of education at all, but for affecting the religious character of the school, or merely in order to be disagreeable. His impression had been very greatly increased by the manner in which the agitation against this Bill had been conducted. If politicians could say in public things manifestly untrue, could excite prejudice to the utmost, and be restrained apparently by no considerations of decency whatever, how were they to suppose the Bill would be administered by persons of the same character? It was possible for a certain kind of mind to act as he had indicated, and the Bill ought to be framed with a view of guarding the religious character of the schools against that sort of attack. If the Bill were modified in the direction suggested, it must be under the strict control of some independent authority which would prevent the powers from being misused, particularly in regard to the choice of books. If the choice of books was taken advantage of, not for educational purposes, but in order to injure the religious character of the school, he thought there ought to be a power of interference.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he always experienced extreme pleasure when he saw the noble Lord rise in these debates, because he had the frankness to let the cat out of the bag, and to reveal the real secrets of this Bill. Now that the noble Lord had told them one of the secrets of the Bill, he himself was relieved from secrecy in regard to the confidential conversation which he had with one of the principal authors of the Bill. He had asked, "How can you insist, as you do, upon this extraordinary and unjust majority which you give to the managers?" "Oh!" was the reply, "it is necessary on account of Wales." That was the cat which had been let out of the bag. A select number of Welsh Members sat behind the noble Lord, but he did not know whether they were grateful to him. He could only tender the noble Lord thanks on behalf of the Welsh Members who sat on that side of the House, for his speech would be an additional reason for the confidence which their constituents reposed in them. He was not very much surprised that the noble Lord insisted that the local authorities, especially in Wales, should not have the choice of books. Up to this time they had had the choice of books, and he did not know where the noble Lord derived the information that they would in future behave in the manner which he condemned. Welsh education stood in advance of this country, and, therefore, the charges which the noble Lord brought against it arose from want of information with respect to Welsh education. He could quite understand the feelings of the noble Lord on the question of books, however; what he would like, no doubt, would be that the Education Department should be constituted a *Propaganda Fide*, and he did not know any one who would more ably and zealously preside over such a body than the noble Lord. He was quite sure the noble Lord had already in his pocket an *Index Expurgatorius* which would lay down, for the information of Welsh County Councils, the books he disapproved of, which ought not to be admitted into secondary or elementary schools. He supposed that the noble Lord would exclude certain parts of English history. He supposed the history of the House of Tudor, with the exception, perhaps, of a single female member, would not be admitted. The reign of Henry VIII. would not be admitted, nor Edward VI. Probably there might not be objection to Edward VI.'s successor, but the reign of Elizabeth the noble Lord would perhaps not approve of. The speech of the noble Lord had made it essential on the part of Welsh Members to insist that on this question of the choice of books the rights of the local education authority should be guarded.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he was sorry to come between the Welsh Members and the noble Lord, but he should like to refer for a moment to the Amendment and to two points which might be dealt with by the local education authority, namely, the choice of books and the use of the school buildings. He thought they must all agree with the Prime Minister that the less there was said about books the better it would be for the peace of the House now and for the peace of the local authority in the future. They were dealing now with the provision of elementary day schools, and what was demanded by way of use of the buildings was something quite outside elementary education, and consequently quite outside the range of the objects for which the schools were to be provided by the managers, subject to the local authority, and had nothing to do with this part of the Bill.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said the speech of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich was quite irrelevant to the Amendment. He was sorry that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education had not paid some attention to the point raised by his predecessor in office. He submitted that the hon. Member for Cambridge University had raised a point which at any rate was worthy of consideration. It was whether the county authority could use these schools for evening instruction or prize distributions. If the Bill, as suggested by the noble Lord, was to be made worse than it was in order to meet the case of Wales, the Welsh were quite willing to be left out of the Bill. If that would be for the advantage of the English Schools they were all perfectly willing to take that step. When the noble Lord spoke he always instilled into their debates the spirit of Christian charity, but it was so concentrated in his perorations that there was none to spare for the ordinary business of Committee. He was the light and the acolyte of a Party on the other side, and he might learn from some Conservative Members near him that as far as Wales was concerned the County Councils were perfectly harmonious in matters educational. There had not been the slightest friction or disagreement from 1899 until today. The real point was—were they or were they not entitled to ask that the local authority should have control over the school buildings? He thought they were entitled to ask the Government to consider this point.

MR. M'KENNA said it was essential, if they were to carry out the main objects of the Bill, that the local education authority should have power to decide what the character of the school building should be. As the Bill stood the local authority had not the power to decide whether they could use the school for evening classes. He did not think justice had been done to the language used by the noble lord who spoke of the virulence of the Celtic temperament. In Monmouthshire they were proud of claiming the noble lord as the descendant of an ancient Welsh family, and when he avowed that virulence was a characteristic of that race he was only describing an attribute of his own. It had been alleged over and over again that the local authority were to have control over the schools outside of religious instruction. If the local authority were to have absolute control over secular and primary education hon. Members were entitled to ask whether they were to have the power, if local needs required it, to declare that a voluntary school should be for boys or girls, or a mixed school, and if they were not to have that power they must ask the First Lord of the Treasury to qualify the statement that the local authority were to have complete control over secular education.

(7.26.) Question, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment," put, and agreed to.

Question put, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The Committee divided; Ayes, 132; Noes, 257. (Division List No. 402.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshr.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt Hon. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cook
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)

Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A (Worc'r
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thomas H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fr'd Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred, S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W (Salop
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E. (Wigt'n
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pemberton, John S. G.
Penn, John
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne

Ratcliff, R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Major JEB (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Abel H (Hertford, East)
Smith, HC. (North'mb. Tyns'de
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Colonel Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hon Sir William H
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E (Notts
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell (Birm.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

It being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

EVENING SITTING.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [20th October], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

(9.0.) MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) resuming the speech he was delivering on Monday when the debate was adjourned, said the Bill, at first sight, seemed a very small matter, but it was nothing of the kind. It was a hardy annual of the most improper character. The bringing in of the Women's Franchise Bill year after year could be understood, but this Bill was a most delightful example of the illogical nature of the British Constitution and the illogical nature of the British Parliament. Some of the Acts in this Expiring Laws Continuance Bill were good Acts, but there were some very, very bad ones. If there were good Acts in the Schedule they ought in a frank and honest way to be placed upon the Statute Book, while the bad ones should not be renewed. There was the Sunday Closing (Ireland) Act. That might or might not be a good Act, but it was an Act of enormous importance, and one which the majority of the Irish people believed to be a good Act. Why should a measure of that kind be held in a state of suspended animation? If it was an Act good for Ireland, an Act of which the majority of the Irish people approved, it should have a permanent place on the Statute Book. At present they did not know whether it was going to be the law of the land from year to year, for an Amendment might at any time be moved by a clever and ingenious Parliamentarian to strike it out of the Schedule of this Bill. There were a number of Acts in this Bill which ought to be dealt with at once. There were Acts going back to 1855, with Amendments carrying them on to 1885. The Linen Manufacturers' Act of Ireland had been carried on by fragmentary and most unsatisfactory legislation of this kind. Would not the proper thing be to consolidate these Acts once and for all and bring them into one short Act, and make them the Statute law of the land? There were many Acts to which he might refer, but there was one—the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act—1881, the continuance of which by the Government required some explanation. What was the position with regard to that Act? Rightly or wrongly it was passed twenty-one years ago. Certain arguments were brought forward in favour of it, but would those arguments prevail now? It was not a Peace Preservation Act, but an Act relating to the carrying and possession of arms, and in Ireland it was commonly called the Arms Act. That Act remained in force in Ireland. As the outcome of the War, they had rifle clubs established in England and Scotland. Why should they not have rifle clubs in Ireland? With this Act they could not have rifle clubs, and could not even carry a revolver, sword, or dagger.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, Order. It is not open to the hon. Member to discuss the merits of the Acts. That can be done by moving an Amendment to omit them on the Committee Stage.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N): There is a precedent in 1874.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Whatever may have been done in 1874, it was not allowed in 1887.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: The rule was broken by Mr. Disraeli.

Mr. FLYNN said the Arms Act might have been a good Act twenty years ago, but was it right that no one should be allowed to carry arms now without the consent of a magistrate? These Acts were passed as temporary measures in exceptional circumstances, but they had never been reviewed since, and had been carried on from year to year without any addition to the argument which gave them birth. In session and out of session they must raise their protest against this archaic method of legislation and this slipshod manner of dealing with the people. He knew the one thing a British statesman abhorred was that thing called logic, but, as a logician, he protested against the frame of mind which induced them to legislate in this haphazard manner. The measure he had last referred to worked great mischief, and ought to be altered, and he protested against an Act which prevented the people of Ireland as freemen having the right to carry arms, a right enjoyed by every freeman in every civilized country.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said he had no intention of discussing the merits of any Act in the Schedule of this Bill, but he did think the time had come when the House should ask itself whether that Schedule ought not to be revised. He had risen with the sole purpose of pointing out that among the Acts in the Schedule of the Bill was the Ballot Act of 1872. The explanation of the inclusion of that Act in the Schedule was that an Amendment was moved in the House of Lords—an unconstitutional Amendment, in his opinion—which made the Act temporary; but to call the Ballot Act, which had been on the Statute Book thirty years, a temporary measure was a monstrosity. He thought that the next time the Bill was brought in the Schedule should be revised, and such Acts as the Ballot Act be made perpetual. He hoped that the Government would give this matter consideration.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) wished to say a few words in support of the suggestion of his hon. friend the Member for Dundee, for this Bill was the means of constantly bringing before the House two classes of Acts—one class which ought to be permanently on the Statute Book and the other a class of legislative lumber which ought to be cleared away as rapidly as possible. Among the Acts in the Schedule which ought to be made perpetual was the Poor Rate Exemption Act of 1840, under which personal property, such as stocks and shares, were exempted from poor-rate. That Act was the basis at this moment of our system of taxation, and it was astounding that for so many successive years it had only been kept alive by means of an annual measure. Among the lumber in the Schedule which should be removed was the Linen Manufacturers Act, which laid down regulations absolutely inconsistent with the present character of the business; the Promissory Notes Act, and the Militia Ballot Act, and another measure of an equally obsolete character, viz., the Act for the regulation of locomotives on the highways. Under it locomotives were restricted to a speed of four miles an hour in the country and two miles an hour in towns. If that meant anything it meant that the motoring of today was illegal. The fact was the laws of this country required consolidation and codification, and he earnestly hoped that the Government would take this matter in hand.

(9.30.) Mr. T. M. HEALY said that Lord Carnarvon in 1873, in the House of Lords, entered an emphatic protest against this system of legislating by means of an expiring Laws Continuance Bill. The Bill to which Lord Carnarvon referred contained the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, and thirty-four other measures, exactly the same number as were contained in the present Bill. Since the noble Lord's protest was made in 1873 they had not got a bit further in the way of a reform of the system. It was formerly the practice of this House never to pass a Bill of this kind except after it had been carefully considered in Committee. In 1873, Mr. Disraeli and Lord Salisbury were rather coquetting for the Irish vote, and Lord Salisbury also entered a strong protest against the inclusion in the Continuance Bill of the Peace Preservation Act. He said that he objected to the vicious practice of including so many Acts in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, which afforded the Government an opportunity of smuggling Acts, against which there was very considerable objection, too quietly through the House. In the following year they had the pledges of Mr. Disraeli, Lord Salisbury, Sir Stafford Northcote, and Sir M. Hicks-Beach, who was then Irish Secretary, that the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act would not be included in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. When the Bill was brought in in 1874, Mr. Disraeli had taken office, and of course everybody remembered the protest that had been made by Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords, and how he had been answered by Lord Kimberley. Mr. Butt, who was a great constitutional lawyer, was allowed to move—

> "That in the opinion of this House it is inexpedient that when important Acts of Parliament have been passed for a limited period, any of such Acts, especially those conferring on the Executive extraordinary powers, should be included in a general Bill for the continuance of expiring laws, brought in at the close of the session, without affording any fair opportunity of considering the propriety of their discontinuance or their modification."

Motions were afterwards made by Sir Stafford Northcote and Mr. Butt to omit parts of the Act which were objected to. He was well aware that since that time successive Speakers by successive rulings had attempted to restrict the right of this High Court of Parliament to discuss the Acts contained in the Continuance Bill, but with regard to the pledges which were given in 1874 by the Conservative Ministry as to Irish exceptional legislation, he maintained that the whole of the Conservative party were bound by these pledges. On July 25th, 1874, Captain Nolan moved that the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill be read a second time that day three months. He would not go into the hon. Gentleman's argument, but it turned largely on the point that there was no crime in Ireland. Sir Stafford Northcote in reply said, as reported in (3) *Debates*, ccxxi., 725—

> "That he quite agreed with the hon. and gallant Member that care ought to be taken that measures should not be introduced unnecessarily by a Bill of the kind, which must lead to a discussion of various subjects. . . . It was possible that they might find that that system was carried rather too far, and that point he undertook to say should receive careful consideration."

And then he went on to

> "suggest that hon. Members in Committee might very properly move Amendments for the purpose of striking out certain portions of the Acts to which they objected."

The Attorney-General of the day justified the continuance of the Peace Preservation Act on the ground that a murder had been committed. Mr. Disraeli came into the House later in the debate and apologised for his absence. He said—

> "He would be happy to make a suggestion which he thought would meet the case. He remembered very well the remarks of his colleagues (Lord Salisbury and Lord Carnarvon) in the House of Lords, and he could not say that he disagreed with them. He was perfectly ready to say that those two Acts [the Arms Act and the Master and Servants Act] should no longer be contained in a Continuance Bill."

It was twenty-eight years since that promise was made, and he was sorry to say that successive administrations had not adhered to it. Mr. Disraeli went on to say—

> "That if any continuance were wanted, which he should regret, they should be brought in separately at an early period of the session, when there would be an opportunity of discussing their merits."

When the Bill got into Committee later on there was further discussion on it, and the Attorney-General for Ireland said on July 30th—(reported in the same volume at page 982)—

> "The Prime Minister had given a distinct assurance that if it should be proposed to renew these Acts in another session a separate Bill should be brought in to effect such renewal. . . . He was prepared to say that the whole of this subject ought to be reviewed, and every one of these Bills examined by the Government, with a searching inquiry into the different places at present proclaimed."

There had been no such suggestion in regard to the present Bill, which the First Lord of the Treasury had moved by a simple nod of the head. Another promise was made by Sir Stafford Northcote, Chancellor of the Exchequer, who said that, in point of fact, the expressions he had used in regard to this kind of legislation were in strict conformity with the remarks made by Lord Salisbury and Lord Carnarvon in the previous year. He entirely agreed—and he spoke for his colleagues as well as for himself—that it was important that they should put a check on what appeared to be an abuse of their system of renewing Acts. The Chancellor of the Exchequer went on to say—

> "There was a decided feeling on the part of the Government that a check ought to be put on that system of legislation. But with regard to those Irish Acts, his right hon. friend at the head of the Government had promised that they should not on any future occasion be put into an ordinary Omnibus Continuance Bill, but if it was desirable to renew them that they should be dealt with separately."

Then Mr. Henley, the Member for Oxfordshire, who was the parent of the remark that when he could not argue against a particular Bill he would lie on his back and cry "fudge," said—

> "It was a grave question whether the list of expiring laws contained in the Annual Continuance Bill had not grown to an inconvenient length and did not contain many Acts which had better be left out of it."

In the course of the same debate in Committee, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said—

> "In accordance with the statement which he made early in the evening, the Government did not desire to carry this practice of continuing important laws by a mere Continuance Bill further than it has been hitherto carried, but rather to restrict it, and on proper occasions, at a future time, to bring laws which are of importance more directly and conveniently under the notice of the House."

Sir Stafford Northcote wound up by saying that—

> "It was not the intention of the Government to propose a continuance of these Irish Acts again,"

and he asked the Irish Members to believe—

> "that the Government were speaking in good faith."

Were they speaking in good faith? Sir Stafford Northcote was dead, Mr. Disraeli was dead, and Lord Salisbury had retired from political life, but though the question had been reverted to again and again during the past twenty-eight years there, were still exactly the same number of Acts included in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill as there were at that day. Hon. Gentlemen opposite who got up on the hustings and swore by the memory of Lord Beaconsfield, when reminded of *dicta* of this description, would probably turn round and say that they were only speaking in an Irish sense! Mr. Disraeli said the same thing over and over again, and on the Third Reading of the Bill in a speech reported in the same volume of *Hansard*, p. 1076, he dealt, first, with the question of the general policy of expiring laws, and next with the general policy of exceptional legislation for Ireland, and then went on to say—

> "Now, leaving the question of Continuance Acts, I come to the much greater question of Coercion Acts. The hon. and learned Gentleman has, I will not say pressed the Government for an expression of their policy on that subject, but he has very frankly announced that the time will come, and is not far distant, when we must, of course, express our opinions on the matter. When the time comes we shall express our opinion."

And he gave a pledge again that these Acts should not be renewed. When dealing with Ireland, whose members must always be in a permanent minority in this House, he thought that if England could not keep faith with them at the time of the Treaty of Union, or the Treaty of Limerick, they might fairly expect the Conservative Government not to back out of the promises made twenty-eight years ago in regard to measures relating to Ireland, admittedly exceptional in character. By the ruling of the Chair it was impossible for them to discuss the merits of those Acts on the Second Reading of the Continuance Bill, and it was a denial of justice that Irish Members should be asked to discuss questions of great constitutional importance in a fragmentary way when a measure like the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill was introduced. Lord Salisbury in a moment of darkness for this country two years ago recommended his fellow countrymen to form rifle clubs; the noble Lord did not say that Ireland was excepted; his general recommendation was that his fellow countrymen should be brought up to the practice of arms. He thought, especially when they knew that there was one particular corner in Ireland which had not been subjected to this particular form of legislation, although it was the most turbulent portion of Ireland, where men had sackfuls of arms, and on 12th July had sometimes even fired cannons——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! the hon. Member is not in order in making these observations.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that this was a portion of the great difficulty in which the Irish Members were placed. He respectfully said that the mere fact that such a ruling had been given by the Chair was the best condemnation of this class of legislation. They were not allowed to discuss the Acts embraced in the Continuance Bill, and he respectfully made his protest against this system of legislation, and against the practice of relying on those great constitutional authorities.

(9.55.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member has had a long Parliamentary experience, and he possesses great Parliamentary ability, but the task he has set himself to perform tonight is nothing more formidable or difficult than to show that our present system of continuing, from year to year, a large number of statutes which no human being expects or desires to see repealed, is by no means a reasonable or rational method of carrying on public business. I agree, and I do not believe there is a single Member of the House who dissents from that view. I cannot imagine, for instance, that anyone should suppose that the Ballot Act should really be regarded as a temporary measure, to be continued casually, year after year, or to be dropped if the passing mood desires it; for, manifestly, it has now become an essential part of the constitution of the country, not again to be changed except after mature deliberation and careful debate. Therefore, I agree with the hon. Gentleman, but he knows well enough that the Parliamentary difficulties of successive Governments in long succession, lasting far beyond the memory of probably every man I am now addressing, have forced that course upon us. These Parliamentary difficulties are not diminishing, they are increasing. There are thirty-five measures included in this Bill, the greater part of them very important, some of them very controversial. We have now been, I am afraid to say how many months, discussing seven clauses and a quarter of one single Bill. How is the business of the country to be conducted if it takes you so long to deal with a measure, controversial in its substance but very modest in its proportions, if, in addition to new legislation which from time to time the House may require to discuss, you are to have a controversial debate upon the thirty-five measures embodied in this Bill? The thing is not business, it is not practicable, it cannot be done. [HON. MEMBERS: "Hear, hear!"] I gather from that cheer that hon. Members think the task would be easy if they were removed to a happier sphere, and were to have their own Expiring Laws Continuance Bill at College Green. It might be easier. I make full tribute to the contribution of hon. Members to our debates, but I do not think it would be easy even with a Parliament so relieved. The truth is, if you really mean in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill to discuss the merits of the measures continued—and that is what the hon. Member means—not only the whole system of Parliamentary work would be dammed up, but you would have a stagnant lake instead of a moving and health-giving current. You would always go over the old ground, and you cannot carry on your work in that way. The problem which the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill raises is part of the larger problem connected with the codification and statute law revision and other matters; and with one of the objects, at all events, I have put down proposals for general acceptance in the new proposed Standing Orders which we have not yet had time to discuss. If the House is content to delegate some of its powers to a Committee of its own, and to restrict its own interference in its full corporate capacity to certain clear and definite issues not to be debated at great length, but to be divided upon, then this evil can be got over. But it cannot be got over at all if you are to go through the Bills seriatim, to state all that is to be said for and against them, added to suggestions to omit great portions of individual measures, and coupled with a general survey of the policy, as a whole, which they involve.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Why not make them perpetual?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: You cannot make them perpetual. It would be easy to bring in a Bill to make them perpetual; but is the House prepared to do that without preliminary examination?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: "Some of them."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, but who is to select the some? Of course, there are some upon which we are all agreed; but you cannot deal with these matters in an off-hand manner, and certainly you cannot deal with them this session. Government after Government have failed to find the necessary time, and I say these matters can only be dealt with if the House consents to preliminary examination and consents not to revise clause by clause these thirty-five measures, or any large number or portions of them by subsequent discussion. I do not know that we have reached that period yet; the present session certainly is not available, and a plan for remedy cannot be found until the House is less occupied with first-class measures than it is at present. We cannot for some time to come attempt any remedy of the kind. We must follow the expedient, illogical, unjustifiable method adopted by our predecessors for carrying on the work of the country. This will not commend itself to the hon. and learned Gentleman, but I do not ignore the difficulties he has stated and I associate myself with condemnation of the system. I do not, however, see a remedy until some preliminary examination can take place and the House is prepared so to arrange the issues to be discussed that they shall not take too large a portion of any particular session. No Government with large measures to bring forward can give up a session to the subject. We must find a method, not yet discovered, for dealing with the subject, and I greatly fear, after the experience we had at the beginning of the session, in regard to the amount of opposition we met with in our attempt to simplify procedure — I greatly fear, even if I were able to find a remedy, I should not be able to get the House to adopt it without prolonged fighting, which painful experience has taught me may compel Members to sit at times when they would rather be on holiday—for dealing with measures in which the country at large is deeply interested.

MR. FLETCHER MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston) said that the First Lord of the Treasury had defended an abuse by the method known to lawyers as "confession and avoidance." He frankly admitted that it was quite impossible to avoid the abuse. He himself had a very strong objection to such a method of legislation, but he quite agreed that if they were to waste a large portion of the time of the House in each session in dealing with the matter, it would be a great hardship. If the Government would, however, only take the responsibility on its own shoulders, there was a very easy method of putting an end to the abuse. They ought to have two Bills, one an Expiring Laws Perpetuation Bill, and the other an Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. Such Acts as the Ballot Act, and a number of other Acts in the Schedule ought, on the responsibility of the Government, to be extended not for one year, but perpetually, until the House had changed its mind in regard to them and had repealed them. There would be no more difficulty in passing an Expiring Laws Perpetuation Bill than there was now in passing an Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. The Perpetuation Bill would include measures on which the country had from long use made up its mind, and the Continuance Bill would include measures on which the country was still in doubt, and which deserved only to be regarded as settled in a temporary way. He hoped that there would be a division on the Second Reading of the present Bill, as a protest against the slovenly method which heaped together in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill measures which ought to be rendered perpetual. The First Lord of the Treasury asked who was to decide; but what had they a Government for if it was not to decide such matters? If there were an Expiring Laws Perpetuation Bill, he was satisfied that it would be passed practically with the assent of the entire House, and even if there were some dispute, it would not be greater than that connected with the present Bill, and in this way work would be cleared for future sessions.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he thought the House would feel that they were justified in raising a debate on the Second Reading of this Bill. The Government would not have put down the Bill as the first Order, if they had not expected a debate; and it was perfectly obvious that the question which had been raised was a very important one. The First Lord of the Treasury himself admitted the difficulty and importance of the matter, but he said that it was impossible to effect a remedy. His hon. and learned friend had pointed out a very simple remedy in regard to certain of the Acts mentioned in the Schedule to the perpetuation of which the House would unquestionably unanimously assent. There were two classes of Acts which he thought might be taken out of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. There was for instance the Corrupt Practices Act, regarding which no less than five expiring laws were continued in the Bill. That was an Act which required codification; it was already practically the law of the country; and the House would pass it without any difficulty at all. Then there was another class of Acts which had been amended, some of them eight times and others five or six times, by subsequent Acts. One of their great difficulties as Members of Parliament was legislation by reference, which made it almost impossible to understand how a particular Act actually stood. In the schedule there were Acts passed fifty or sixty years ago, which were still referred to in Acts recently passed. Surely a very simple remedy for such a state of things would be to codify the various amending Acts in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, and remove the difficulty of legislation by reference. He admitted that there was a third class of Acts which could not be dealt with in the manner suggested. He thought the House was not dealing fairly with such an Act as that which had been mentioned by the hon. and learned Member for North Louth in continuing it year after year. That measure was passed on a distinct pledge being given to the House of Commons that it would be a temporary Act, and it was not fair or just that an Act of that kind, which affected the personal liberty of the person, and which was passed as a temporary Act, should be rendered permanent. He was very glad that the Government had given the House an opportunity of discussing the matter, and he hoped that the debate would lead to the removal of an abuse from their system of legislation.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said he did not intend to unduly prolong the discussion, as he was especially anxious to please the Leader of the House, who, during the absence of his hon. and learned friend the Member for Waterford, who was attending Irish meetings in America and receiving telegrams from the President of the United States—in Ireland it would have been the plank bed; in America it was the hospitality of the White House—had admirably led the Irish Party. The acting Leader of the Irish Party on the Treasury Bench made a speech which was quite worthy of his hon. and learned friend the Member for Waterford, because it was a most admirable and well-conceived though subtle plea for devolution and Home Rule. The right hon. Gentleman practically admitted the case against the present Bill. The Bill perpetuated a number of laws, which were obsolete and absolutely inapplicable to present-day conditions. It included measures which formed part of the indestructible and irrevocable law of the nation, and they were brought forward as if they were only temporary measures. Therefore the Bill had the double vice of perpetuating the obsolete, and of representing as temporary what was permanent. The First Lord of the Treasury admitted the case, but he made no reply to the main objection to the Bill from the Irish point of view. In addition to the obsolete laws which were perpetuated, and the perpetual laws which ought not to be represented as temporary, the Bill included fundamental and vital measures dealing with primordial liberties, which ought to be the subject of special legislation and due discussion in this House. He was not going to discuss the merits or demerits of the peace proclamation measure, especially as they would have an opportunity of doing that in Committee; but he would say that an Act which was a restraint of the liberties of one part of the Empire in comparison with other parts of the Empire, was of such fundamental and supreme importance that it deserved better than to be bundled among a number of obsolete measures. That was his point. He also thought he was entitled to say that an Act which the leaders of the Conservative Party solemnly pledged themselves to exclude from such a measure as the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill should not be included, and that the pledge which was given ought not to be nullified or negatived. He held that the Government of the day was as much bound in that manner as the Government of yesterday, or of ten or twenty years ago. They would divide against the Second Reading of this Bill, not because they were opposed to some of the measures mentioned in it, but because they wished to protest against that method of dealing with measures in restraint of the liberties of the Irish people. Those measures should not be bundled with the flotsam and jetsam of the antediluvian rubbish of past legislation. The Crimes Act in Ireland, which was now in full operation, was a perpetual Act as far as legislation could make it perpetual. Supposing it was a measure which had been enacted for five years, would it be fair or tolerable that in the sixth year it should take its place among the other thirty-five measures in the present Bill. As he had said, in gratitude to the services which the Prime Minister had rendered to the Irish Party in denying them one day and giving them several, he did not propose to prolong the debate, but would content himself with voting against the Second Reading.

(10.20.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 176; Noes, 98. (Division List, No. 403.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.
Cavendish, V C W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall; Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midl'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfo'd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Milvain, Thomas
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin. Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas. Thomson

Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, HC (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt. Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H. (Asht'n-und-Lyne
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cawley, Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Delvin, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Ffrench, Peter
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harrington, Timothy
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Patrick James
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Govern, T.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shee, James John
Pirie, Duncan N.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore Cook
Thomas, Sir. A (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas J. A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Bill read a second time and committed for tomorrow.

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered as amended.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) moved the following new Clause:—

"An invention covered by any patent granted on an application to which Section 1 of this Act applies shall not be deemed to have been anticipated by reason only of its publication in a specification deposited in the Patent Office pursuant to an application made not less than fifty years before the date of the application for a patent therefor or of its publication in a provisional specification of any date not followed by a complete specification."

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central) said he had no objection to the Clause.

Clause read the first and second time, and added.

Amendments made.

MR. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich) said he desired to move the Amendment standing in his name. The effect of it would be to give the Board of Trade more power than they now possessed. Under the Bill as it stood, the Board of Trade had the power to dismiss a petition or refer it to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but that Committee was a very expensive tribunal, perhaps even more expensive than the High Court, and in the interests of small manufacturers especially, the Board of Trade ought to have power to grant a patent. He moved the Amendment in the interests of the small manufacturers, of whom there were several in his constituency, and he thought unless some Amendment of this nature was added to the Bill, small manufacturers would be left very much in the position they were at present. He moved principally in the interests of the aniline colour trade, and he thought it was necessary that the House should know something about how that trade had been conducted before they came to a decision on the matter. That trade was initiated in this country, the raw material came from this country, and most of the product was consumed in this country, yet nine-tenths of the trade was done on the Continent, principally by Germans. He thought it was a little humiliating to this country that we should allow a trade, of which the raw material was supplied in this country and the product consumed here, to go to Germany. He thought also it was some reflection upon the Board of Trade that they had not seen that English manufacturers were not placed at a disadvantage, as they had been. Out of every hundred patents granted in this country forty were not applied for in Germany, and, if applied for, were not granted. The result was that Germans came to this country, got patents, manufactured the article in Germany, and the British consumer had to pay a very large price for it, because it could not be manufactured here, whereas the consumer in Germany could get it at half the price the consumer had to pay here. He wanted to show that if the Bill remained as it was the small manufacturers in this country would have no chance. Take a man with £1,000 or £2,000 capital, who wanted to make a colour that was already manufactured in Germany. He wanted the ingredients for that colour, and he went to the Board of Trade. The Board of Trade would say, "Oh, yes, make a *primâ facie* case out, and we will refer it to the Privy Council." What was the trader's remedy? He had to start a lawsuit before the most expensive tribunal in the country before he could get it. That was prohibitive to any small manufacturer, for the whole of his capital might be swallowed up in law costs. Therefore, it would be well if the Board of Trade had power not merely to dismiss a patent, but to grant one. At present they had only power to dismiss and power to refer to the Privy Council. He wanted to see the Board of Trade take the small British manufacturer under their care, as against the foreigner who had been abusing our country for years and years, and if the Board would take our commerce under their care, we should not have so much to complain of as regarded foreign competition as we had had in the past.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 6, to leave out the words from the word 'Trade,' to end of sub-Section 2, and insert the words 'may either dismiss or allow the petitition, or refer it to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

"When the Board of Trade allows a petition, it may order the patentee to grant licences, or may revoke the patent, in the same manner and on the same conditions as the Judicial Committee is hereinafter empowered to make such order or to revoke a patent.

"Any decision or order of the Board of Trade under this sub-Section, other than an order referring a petition, shall be subject to appeal to the Judicial Committee, who shall have full power to confirm, alter, or reverse the same.

"When a petition is referred, or taken on appeal to the Judicial Committee, the Board of Trade shall make a report to the Judicial Committee setting forth such particulars as it shall think fit, and the same shall be forthwith communicated to all parties interested.'"—(*Mr. Cawley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. BRIGG said he wished to support the Amendment, the object of which was to simplify and cheapen, as far as possible, the means of obtaining a patent. Many small inventors were now prevented from obtaining a patent because of the expense. At present the Board of Trade had the power to dismiss a petition, but they should also be given power to grant a petition, with the right of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. He did not know how far the Board of Trade would feel justified in taking on itself the duty it was now asked to take, but anything that could be done to help a small inventor ought to be done. The

Amendment deserved the consideration of the Board of Trade and of the House in order that the industry of the country might be helped as far as possible.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR said the particular modification desired by the hon. Member for Prestwich was very fully discussed in the Committee upstairs and rejected, as he thought, for excellent reasons. What the Bill proposed was that applications should, in the first instance, be made to the Board of Trade, who could then act the part of conciliator between the patentee and those who were seeking for a licence. If the parties were unable to come to an agreement with the assistance of the Board of Trade, the Board of Trade might, if in its opinion there was a *prima facie* case, refer the petition to the Privy Council, and the Privy Council decided at once and for all. Until the petition was referred to the Privy Council no expense of any kind was involved upon either of the parties, but he imagined that, in the case of the small manufacturers of whom the hon. Member spoke, it would be possible for the Board of Trade to bring the parties together, in the majority of instances at all events. But if it were not possible to bring them together, it was open to the patentee to appeal to the Privy Council against the decision of the Board of Trade if it were in favour of the applicant; and if that were done it was obvious that the small manufacturer would gain nothing, because he would necessarily have to appear before the very tribunal the expense of which was made the reason for recommending the hon. Member's scheme.

MR. CAWLEY said that his idea was to throw the onus on the patentee, instead of on the applicant. If the onus were thrown on the foreign patentee, it would be a very different case altogether.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR said that the hon. Member was mixing up two things. Under the Bill as it left the Committee, if the patented article were manufactured abroad, the onus would lie on the patentee of proving that the reasonable requirements of the public in respect of the invention had been satisfied. The Bill did throw that onus on the patentee, but the effect of the hon. Member's scheme, if it were carried, would be this—the Board of Trade would not accept the task of deciding upon matters in which very great pecuniary interests were constantly involved without referring them to a tribunal constituted *ad hoc.* There would be an arbitrator whose expenses would have to be paid, and there would be the expenses of counsel, and the result would be that, where a case was carried from the decision of the Board of Trade to the Privy Council, so far from the expenses being diminished, they would be doubled. In the first place there would be the expense of the arbitrator appointed by the Board of Trade, and in the second place there would be the expense of a trial before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The object of the Amendments which the Government introduced into the Bill in Committee was to diminish the expenses as far as possible, and with that view they had arranged that there should be only one trial of these matters before a court, and that from that court there should be no appeal, and it was obvious that if there was to be no appeal the court should be a strong and a satisfactory court. He believed they could not get a better court for the purpose than the Privy Council, and it was for that reason the Government substituted the Privy Council for the High Court. His own belief was that under the procedure which the Bill now contemplated, namely, a petition in the first instance to the Board of Trade and an attempt to bring the parties together, and, if that attempt failed, leaving it open to appeal to the Privy Council, they would get at once the cheapest and most satisfactory procedure available.

MR. CALDWELL said that a great deal had been said in favour of the Amendment. He was afraid that the President of the Board of Trade thought that the Board of Trade was not a very suitable tribunal for trying matters of the kind mentioned in the first instance.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR said that the hon. Member was entirely mistaken. He might remind him that the Committee on whose Report the Bill was founded expressly recommended that the Board of Trade should not be entrusted any longer with the decision of these important cases.

MR. CALDWELL said the point was simply to determine whether any invention was being worked in such a way as to comply with the requirements of the Act. That was really a matter for the Board of Trade, with their experts and means of examination. The proposal of the Amendment was that when a *primâ facie* case was made out the Board of Trade should take upon itself the responsibility of giving a decision on the matter. It was no use the Board trying to bring the parties together unless they had the power, in the event of the parties not coming to an agreement, to give a decision subject to appeal. If that power were given the probability was that the parties would come to an agreement.

Question put and agreed to.

MR. WHITLEY moved the omission of sub-Section 2, in order that the Act should come into operation as soon as it received the Royal Assent.

MR. G. W. BALFOUR accepted the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (BILLS IN PARLIAMENT) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

(11.0.) THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk), in moving the second reading of this Bill, said it proposed to effect certain changes in the law which for many years had been urged upon successive Governments by private Members on both sides of the House. The County Councils had no power under the Act of 1888 to oppose private Bills in Parliament, but they had no power to promote such Bills, although the smallest boroughs in the country were able to do so. Much inconvenience sometimes resulted from this lack of power, as it was impossible to have a great county scheme for any purpose if a Bill in Parliament was required to carry it out. Clause 1 gave to the County Councils the same power to promote Bills as was possessed by borough and urban district councils. The second part of the Bill dealt with some Amendments of the Borough Funds Act of 1872. Under that Act a borough or urban district council had to obtain the consent of a meeting of owners and ratepayers to the promotion of, or opposition to, a private Bill in Parliament, and a poll might be demanded by a single ratepayer or owner at the meeting. If a poll was demanded it was taken, not in the manner in which polls were usually taken in this country, but by means of voting papers left at the houses of the electors, and subsequently collected. These were defects in the law which the Government proposed to amend. They proposed to continue, but in a form more suitable to modern ideas, the requirement of the consent of the electors as a check upon the desire to promote Bills. There was to be a public meeting of the parochial electors — the widest franchise in the country—at which the chairman might be required to put the Bill in sections, instead of putting it to the meeting as a whole, as at present. It was also proposed in the Bill that a poll might be demanded within ten days by not less than 100 parochial electors, or one-twentieth of the electors, whichever might be the smaller number. It would no longer be possible for one man to put the borough or district to the expense of a poll. With regard to the opposing of a Bill, it was possible that at very short notice opposition might require to be taken up, and with the present complicated machinery, requiring twenty-one days notice and a meeting of the owners and ratepayers, it was sometimes difficult for a council to oppose a Bill which they thought ought to be opposed in the interests of their constituents. The Government proposed that, as the opposing of a Bill was not a very costly matter, the meeting of owners and ratepayers, or of the parochial electors, should be dispensed with. The Bill gave no additional subjects for private Bill legislation, and did not increase the prospects of a large amount of money being spent on the promotion of private Bills, but would really reform certain defects in a somewhat antiquated method of procedure.

Motion made and Question proposed—"That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Grant Lawson.*)

MR. CALDWELL congratulated the hon. Member on the clear manner in which he had described the Bill. The measure would undoubtedly effect a great improvement in regard to the County Councils. It had always been the Unionist Party that had objected to the county councils having the power to promote Bills, and he was glad they had at last recognised the fact that these bodies were almost equal to having the power already possessed by the smallest borough in England. There was a good deal of advancement required in these matters, and he welcomed this advance because it was in the right direction. In the case of boroughs the ratepayers were all interested, and it was inconceivable that there should be a Bill promoted for a particular locality applicable only to one section. In future the consent of the parties would have to be obtained before the Bill was proceeded with. A County Council had often to deal with matters which did not relate to the county as a whole. Obviously in such a case it would not be covnenient to have a poll of the electors of the whole county, and there might be a difficulty in getting a poll for a section. He congratulated the hon. Gentleman opposite upon the lucid manner in which he had explained the provisions of the Bill, and also the Government upon the advancement they were making, and he hoped they would be encouraged to bring forward other Bills of a similar character.

(11.15.) SIR ALBERT ROLLIT thought the local authorities were very much indebted to the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board for effecting this real reform in local government. He was glad the Bill retained the principle of holding a public meeting, and it made this check much more real and effective than it had been in the past. Occasionally differences of opinion had impaired the effectiveness of public meetings, but now they would have the advantage of the poll being demanded by a substantial number and not by one single individual, who from personal reasons might cause an expenditure of something like £1,000. In Liverpool one individual demanded a poll, and the cost amounted to between £2,000 and £3,000. Another advantage of this Bill would be a reform in the system of voting. Under the Borough Funds Act voting papers had to be delivered at each house, and they had to be marked by initials. This led to great confusion, because many voters put crosses, and consequently they did not get the real opinion of the community. One of the great advantages of this measure would be that exception might be taken to only one part of an omnibus Bill without jeopardising the whole Bill. At the present time the question put to the public meeting was the whole Bill, whereas the new practice would be to divide the Bill into parts and then the opinion of the community could be taken upon any part or Clause of the Bill without sacrificing the remainder. The right to oppose Bills was an inherent one, but this Bill would put the matter beyond doubt, and that would be an improvement. He disputed the contention of the hon. Member for Mid Lanark, that those sitting on the Ministerial Benches were unwilling to promote measures of this kind for the welfare of the communities to which they belonged. He was glad to see that in regard to this measure both sides of the House were agreed, and he believed that this Bill would effect a real reform in local government.

Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE said he wished to say a word or two about the first part of the Bill. He desired to thank the President of the Local Government Board for enabling County Councils to promote Bills in Parliament. This power had already been conferred upon small towns in the country. Many hon. Members some time ago endeavoured to get a second reading for a Bill of this character, and they were thankful to the Government for achieving that which had now become impossible for ordinary private Members to do. No matter how zealous hon. Gentlemen opposite might profess themselves to be in regard to legislation of this kind, it was an unfortunate fact that when Bills of this character were promoted by hon. Members on the Ministerial side extending the powers of County Councils, they were apt to be objected to by hon. Gentlemen opposite on some mysterious principle. It was only when the responsible Government from time to time introduced Bills of this character that they could get these reforms carried.

Mr. CALDWELL said that in the case of private Members' legislation the Bill went through very often without any discussion, and he should always object to that course.

Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE replied that the House was perfectly competent to discuss a Bill without objecting after twelve o'clock, but it had now become impossible to carry such measures after twelve o'clock owing to objections raised by hon. Members opposite. [An Hon. Member: What about Banbury.] He was glad to think that the practice of throwing on private Members the risk of having to promote Bills was no longer to continue.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER (Stafford, Lichfield) said he wished to join in the congratulations to the President of the Local Government Board in regard to this Bill, but he did not think the speech which had just been made was quite fair. Bills had been objected to just as often on the opposite side of the House, and very near to the Treasury Bench, and it was not fair to make that sort of accusation apply to one side of the House. With regard to the poll, he thought the number, fixed at 100, ought to be reduced to a more reasonable figure. He was willing to put absolute confidence in the elected representatives, but he did not think it ought to be such a difficult matter to demand a poll as this Bill would make it. To get 100 signatures would be a very difficult thing, especially before the ratepayers had been educated on the subject. He suggested that 25, or at the most 50, signatures would be ample.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.) asked whether the Bill applied to Ireland.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.): No.

Mr. POWER thought there were many provisions in the Bill which would be very useful in Ireland. He did not see why the Bill should not apply to that country.

MR. WALTER LONG said the hon. Member knew that legislation of this kind had always been confined to that part of the country affected by the Acts it was proposed to amend. He had no objection to the extension of the Bill to Ireland, and if the hon. Gentleman proposed it, he should consult with his right hon. friend the Chief Secretary and be guided by his views. He thought the hon. Member for Lichfield rather misunderstood the situation in reference to the number of electors being fixed at 100. The object in view was that County Councils and corporations should be allowed to carry out their wishes unless a substantial number of parochial electors were opposed to their proposals, and to reduce the number as suggested by the hon. Member would not help this object at all. As the hon. Member for Islington had said, boroughs were often put to great expense and inconvenience by polls demanded by one person, who very often was a cantankerous member of the community. He was glad to find that there was agreement on both sides of the House in regard to this Bill.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed for Monday next.

FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

(11.30.) THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover) said he felt it his duty to say one or two sentences upon this Bill. As Irish Members were aware, the fisheries of Ireland were a great national asset. At one time they were worth £400,000 a year, and though at the present time they were not worth so much, they were getting back to their former value. Therefore this Bill dealt with a subject of great importance to Ireland. In recent years in this country, and perhaps more particularly in America, scientific investigations had proved that regulations for the protection of fisheries had an immediate effect in increasing the value of this great national asset. The Bill provided in place of the complicated set of provisions now in vogue that the cost of legal investigation should be borne in future by moneys voted by Parliament, and this was only limited by some very slight safeguards to prevent frivolous cases being brought forward. The Bill also contained precautionary provisions, in regard to those persons who claimed rights because they exercised their right of fishing three times a year. He had already referred to the great value of scientific investigation. Some people pretended that they were conducting scientific investigations who were really doing nothing of the kind. In the third Clause precautions were taken to see that those who were making scientific investigations were doing so, in order to search for truth and not for profit.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time." Debate arising.

MR. POWER said this Bill dealt with questions of vast importance, and if, in the past, more attention had been given to affording proper facilities to fishermen, the fisheries might have been made a source of great income to Ireland. But both inland and sea fisheries had, like everything else under English rule in Ireland, dwindled away. While he admitted that this subject was one of very great importance, he wished to enter his protest against legislation of this kind being taken at the fag end of a debate, without proper opportunities being given for considering the pros and cons. He was not at present in a position to say whether this Bill would work out in the interests of the fisheries of Ireland or not. All the legislation which the right hon. Gentleman and his predecessors had brought forward, with regard to the inland and sea fisheries of Ireland, had always been brought forward at the fag end of a sitting or a session. Last year the Chief Secretary introduced a Bill dealing with the fisheries of Ireland, which they were asked to pass with little or no opportunity for discussion. They ought to be given a fair opportunity of discussing the merits or the demerits of such measures, and Bills ought not to be thrown at them under that system with which the name of the Chief Secretary had become identified with regard to Irish legislation. The question raised by the Clause 2, so far as his constituency was concerned, was of considerable importance to the net fishers on the river, and, if that observation applied to his constituency, it applied with greater force to the constituency represented by his hon. friend the Member for one of the divisions of County Cork. If he recollected properly, a Committee of his colleagues was asked to investigate the merits and demerits of this Bill last year. They went over the Bill carefully, and he understood they submitted certain Amendments to the right hon. Gentleman which they thought were necessary to be inserted. He was informed that the right hon. Gentleman met these suggestions with a *non possumus*, and said they could not be acceded to. If that was the case, the situation had not altered since then, because he believed the gentleman who investigated the Bill had knowledge of this subject, and they decided that if the Amendments they suggested were not adopted, the Bill, so far from doing good, would do harm to Ireland. Under these conditions, he did not think it was reasonable for the right hon. Gentleman to expect them at this hour to go into the merits of the Bill, which, he said, might be of great advantage, or the contrary, to the interests of the fisheries. It might appear a small matter to Members of this House, but it was a matter of great importance to Ireland, and it was for Irish Members to insist on better attention being given to their business, and that, at any rate, if the Government did put it down, it should be done at a time of the session and at a time of the day when they could fully consider the matter. As far as he could remember the opinion of his hon. friend and Leader the Member for Waterford, it was, that if the Amendments recommended by the Committee which was asked to consider the Bill were not accepted by the right hon. Gentleman, they were bound to oppose the Bill. He would expect some of his friends to move the Adjournment of the debate in order to give them an opportunity of considering a matter fraught with considerable importance to the men who ply the fishing industries. These industries were capable of large developments, but they must be careful how they did it.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork Co., Mid) said he fully endorsed the remarks of his hon. friend. He also fully endorsed the remark of the Chief Secretary that this matter was of great national importance and value to Ireland. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman take steps to make it of value by developing the fishing industries? The right hon. Gentleman said there was at present an income of something like £400,000, but if the Government paid proper attention to the development of the industries by means of State subsidies, there would be an income of millions. The Chief Secretary had referred to a sub-Section of Clause 1, which gave the Board of Agriculture the power to decide whether objections were frivolous or otherwise. That meant that it was to be in the power of this Board, which represented the land-owning class of Ireland, to refuse applications made by the poorest people of the country who were most concerned in the promotion of the fishing industries. He maintained if they were going to appoint a tribunal to decide whether an objection was frivolous or otherwise, it should be a tribunal representative of the people, and possessing their confidence. Such a tribunal would be found in the County Council or the District Council. According to the recent report of the Local Government Board these Councils had discharged their duties faithfully and well. This Bill had been submitted to the House without proper explanation as to its scope. They did not know how far it went, and how far it would benefit the fishermen class, but they did know that it was aimed at preserving the rights of the land-owning interests in Ireland. The statement about frivolous complaints and the denial of expenses was not directed against people who were wealthy and able to pay their way, but against poor people who were supposed to make their living out of the industries. The Irish Members had not been given proper time to consider the Bill.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.) said hon. Members for Ireland whose constituencies were interested in the fishing industries along the coast and in rivers, considered the Bill last session and suggested certain Amendments which were put down on the Paper. The Amendments were all rejected by the Chief Secretary, and the Bill for the time was dropped. Now they were asked at this late hour, and with little or no opportunity for preparation, to discuss this very important question, and to deal with a Bill which included in its scope the repeal or alteration of all the Acts of Parliament relating to the Irish fisheries passed between 1842 and 1901. It was ridiculous; it was impossible. One of the most important Amendments suggested to the right hon. Gentleman gave to the County Councils of Ireland, which were directly responsible to the people, and were most anxious to develop the fisheries, representation on the Board that managed the fisheries. That Amendment was not accepted, and until the County Councils got some representation on the Board, the Nationalist Members would persist in opposing the Bill, even though they might feel that a great change was necessary—and that the fisheries could not be developed until there was an alteration of the law. He moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Thomas O'Donnell.*)

*Mr. JOYCE (Limerick) seconded the Motion. He said that during the past two sessions the hon. and learned Member for Waterford had on many occasions drawn attention to the practice of introducing Bills at a late hour, and trying to run them through the House in a hugger-mugger fashion. That would not be allowed without severe and just criticism on the part of the Irish Members. The Chief Secretary, in his most honeyed accents, had stated that this was a very good Bill, but when, on a former occasion, a committee of Irish Members, who presumably knew something of the fisheries, submitted some reasonable Amendments, the right hon. Gentleman could not see his way to accept them. Well, the Irish Members could not see their way to let the Bill pass at this hour of the night, when it could not receive due and adequate discussion. That portion of the Bill in regard to hatcheries was very good, but the portions relating to close time were too ambiguous altogether. They feared very much that the close time provisions were aimed more at the hardworking, poor men who had to make a livelihood by fishing, than at the riparian proprietors in whose interest, he believed, this Bill had been brought forward. What did the Board of Agriculture know with regard to the inland or coast fisheries of Ireland? Surely it was a reasonable thing for the Irish Members to ask that the County Councils and Borough Councils should have due representation on the Board which managed the fisheries. The Chief Secretary would accept everything put forward in the interest of a certain class in Ireland, whose interest was inimical to that of the people. He represented a constituency interested in the greatest salmon and trout industry in Ireland, and he believed that this Bill, instead of serving the interests of the poor fishermen on the Shannon, would be destructive of them. It would decrease rather than increase their earnings. They had been harried and hunted off the river enough already, and the legislation now proposed would hunt them further. He would oppose the Bill so far as in his power.

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Thursday.

SUPREME COURT JUDICATURE BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. CALDWELL objected to the second reading of the Bill being taken at this hour, and pointed out that it did not come within the category described by the Prime Minister as urgent. He moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Caldwell*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at Three Minutes before Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 22nd October, 1902.

The House met at Two of the clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

DUMBARTON CORPORATION (FURTHER POWERS) ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for the abolition of restrictions: from Paddington; Marsden; Jarrow; Bridlington; Hartlepool; Carlisle; Tyldesley; Guildford; Leicester (three); Great Wigston; Kirby Muxloe; Cleckheaton; and Stevenston; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Martock, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Coalville; Paisley; Banbury; Chipping Norton; Glasgow; Kilnhurst; Camelon; Bonnybridge; Sittingbourne; Greenstreet; Faversham; Bridgewater; Wensleydale; Paddington; Marsden; Jarrow and Hebburn; Bridlington; West Hartlepool; Carlisle; Guildford; Kirby Muxloe; Great Wigston; Cleckheaton: Stevenston; and Swaffham and Leicester (four); to lie upon the Table.

FEES FOR BURIAL SERVICES IN PAROCHIAL CEMETERIES.

Petition from Bermondsey, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

MARINE INSURANCE BILL.

Petition from Leith, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: from Coalville; Bridgewater; Faversham; Paisley; Godalming; Banbury; Chipping Norton; Kilnhurst; Camelon; Lennoxtown; Bonnybridge; Sittingbourne; Teynham; Marsden; Harrow Road; Jarrow; Bridlington; Hartlepool; Carlisle; Guildford; Leicester (three); Great Wigston; Kirby Muxloe; Cleckheaton; and Stevenston; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Deddington; and Guildford; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CROFTERS' HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS.

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary for Scotland by the Crofters' Commission on the social condition of the people of Lewis in 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

India—Claims of Sirdar Balvant Ramchandra Natu.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the claims of Sirdar Balvant Ramchandra Natu, of Poona, which were sent to the Secretary of the Governor of Bombay on 25th August, 1901, have yet been considered.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The answer is in the affirmative. On the 15th July last Sirdar Balvant Ramchandra Natu was informed that, as his communication of the 25th August, 1901, purported to be a notice under the Civil Procedure Code, Sec. 424, of his intention to file a suit against the Government, no further orders were deemed necessary.

Indian Volunteers at the Coronation.

Sir SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will say whether Government servants who took privilege leave in order to join the Indian Volunteer Contingent which came home for the Coronation have been informed that they will not receive any pay for the extra period of their detention at home in consequence of the King's illness; and on what grounds this decision has been arrived at.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) I am not aware that any such action has been taken by the Government of India, but I will make inquiries.

Agricultural Banks in India.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India, if he will state what steps have been taken with a view to the establishment of agricultural banks in the various districts of India; have any such banks yet been established; and, if so, will he say where.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The Government of India appointed a Committee to examine and report on various schemes for establishing a general system of agricultural banks. The Committee reported in the autumn of 1901, and its recommendations are under consideration by the Government of India in communication with the local governments. Agricultural banks have been experimentally started in several districts in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh; but I have no statistics on the subject, nor can I say what action has been taken to establish such banks in other provinces in advance of the general scheme.

Carriage of Petroleum on Railways.

Mr. SCOTT MONTAGU (Hampshire, New Forest): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware of the new regulations proposed by the railway companies with reference to the carrying of petroleum spirit or petrol, making the consignors or consignees personally responsible for all claims directly or indirectly caused through the carriage of the said goods; and whether, in view of the fact that for many years these articles have been carried without any damage or accident, he will approach the railway companies with a view to the modification of the new regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I have no information as to the new regulations referred to, but if my hon. friend will furnish me with particulars I will consider whether the Board of Trade can usefully approach the railway companies in the matter.

Imperial Yeomanry—Machine Guns.

Mr. W. F. D. SMITH (Strand, Westminster): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state when the issue of machine guns to regiments of the Imperial Yeomanry will be completed; and to how many regiments has the gun been already issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) It was not found possible to make provision in the current Estimates for the sum required for the issue of machine guns to all the Imperial Yeomanry. Up to date ten regiments have received guns, and four more are being supplied.

Army Certificates of Character.

Mr. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale): To ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the parchment certificate of character (Army Form B 2077) given to all soldiers who served in South Africa, whether he is aware that a rule exists that the men receiving these certificates should not permit them to leave their possession; and, seeing that the Post Office authorities have published a notice calling upon all of its staff returning from the Front to produce the certificates for the inspection of supervising officers, will he state if the men are entitled to obey this order.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) My hon. friend has been misinformed. There is no rule whatever forbidding soldiers to part with their character parchment certificate for proper purposes, and the Post Office authorities are exercising a very wise precaution in calling upon the men to produce their certificates.

Imperial Yeomanry—Scarlet Fever in Natal.

Colonel WELBY (Taunton): To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he is aware that recently a battalion of Imperial Yeomanry infected with scarlet fever was moved into Newcastle, Natal, and no proper precautions of isolation taken; that the battalion remained infected, and communicated the fever to other corps there, while fresh troops were moved into the place; that before the battalion was isolated a considerable force of all arms was infected, with the result that Indian drafts cannot be sent away, and illness and inconvenience have been caused; and whether he will cause inquiry to be made with a view to learning what medical officers are to blame.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I am aware of the outbreak of scarlet fever among the troops at Newcastle, but I have no information at present of the cause. Measures have been taken to secure proper isolation. I have no information to the effect that drafts for India have been delayed. I am causing inquiries to be made as to the origin of the fever.

Alleged Improper Sales at Remount Farms in South Africa.

COLONEL WELBY: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in his inquiries concerning the remount farms at Clark's Siding, South Africa, he will ascertain whether £1,000 worth of potatoes were grown on those farms during the Government leases and sold to private advantage; also, whether the lessor was allowed to charge extra rent for stables, houses, and other buildings which were covered by the leases.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The inquiries being made will include these points.

Remounts—Lord Lonsdale's Position.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Earl of Lonsdale was employed by him, or by his authority, in the supervision or purchase of remounts, and in what capacity; and does the War Office intend to confine its purchases to the ranks of commissioned officers, and to reject all outside expert advice or experience.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Lord Lonsdale was employed under the authority of the Yeomanry Committee in December, 1899. It has been considered desirable mainly to employ commissioned officers in connection with remount work, but there is no intention whatever of rejecting outside advice and experience.

Parliamentary and Municipal Representation for Limited Trading Companies—Practice in the Colonies.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he would lay upon the Table of the House any information he may have received from the self-governing Colonies on the position of limited trading companies as to Parliamentary and municipal representation, with a view to showing whether such companies are entitled to vote by their directors or officers, and, if so, on what franchise; and as to the difference between municipal and Parliamentary representation; and if the lists of voters are prepared by a public or private authority; and whether revision courts are held, and by whom, for the consideration of claims to the Parliamentary and municipal electoral list.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) I will give the information that I have received from the Colonies on this subject in reply to the questions suggested by the hon. Member.

Pacific Islanders Resident in Queensland—Exemption from terms of Pacific Islands Labourers Act.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with reference to his despatch addressed to the Governor of Queensland on the 30th August, 1902, whether he can inform the House as to the steps taken by His Majesty's Government to safeguard the interests of Pacific Islanders who have become residents of Queensland, and who will be liable, under the Pacific Islands Labourers Act, to exclusion from the privileges acquired by them as subjects of the Crown.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) The necessity of dealing carefully with the interests of Pacific Islanders who have become resident in Queensland has been strongly pressed on the Commonwealth Government, and I am confident that they will carry out the law in a liberal spirit. A Despatch from the Governor General on the subject is on its way. I may add that I am not aware that any of these labourers have become subjects of the Crown.

Flags on Private and Public Buildings.

MR. MARTIN (Worcestershire, Droitwich): To ask the First Lord of the

Treasury whether he will consider the advisability of issuing a warrant defining what is the correct flag to be flown on land by civilians, and what flag should be flown on public buildings and at schools in Great Britain and in the Colonies.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The questions which have been raised as to the proper use of flags have received careful consideration by the Government, but they are unable to adopt the course suggested. Nor does it appear desirable to undertake the legislation which would be necessary in order to regulate the general use by civilians, or any class of civilians, of any particular flag on land. It is a matter which is best left, as hitherto, to the guidance of custom and good taste.

Education Bill—Ministers of Religion on the Central Educational Authority.

Mr. FREDERICK WILSON (Norfolk, Mid): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if ministers of religion, who are precluded by law from serving on Town Councils, will be deprived by the Education Bill of the possibility of serving on the central educational authority.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) Clergymen of the Church of England, Priests of the Roman Catholic Church, and Nonconformist Ministers—(*a*) Can be members of County Councils; (*b*) Cannot be members of Town Councils; (*c*) Can be members of the Education Committee of the local education authority.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

South African War—Charges Against British Officers.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the charges, based upon sworn evidence read out in the Cape Parliament on the 28th August last by Mr. Merriman, against two British officers, stationed at Graaff Reinet, to the effect that they attempted in May last to induce a British subject, Paul Michan, by offering to withdraw certain charges against him, to give evidence of treasonable practices against Mr. Merriman and other members of the Cape Parliament; that, upon Michan's refusing to do so, he had been thrown into prison after peace had been declared; and that on the same day charges against the same officers were made in the Cape Parliament by Mr. de Waal—which he offered to substantiate upon oath—the statement made to him personally by two Cape Colonists that similar inducements to give evidence were held out to them when in prison; and will he say whether the officers in question have been given an opportunity to make any explanation as to these charges; and, if so, when and with what results.

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford): I have no information on this subject beyond the published accounts of the proceedings in the Cape Parliament on the 28th August. A report will be called for.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Does the right hon. Gentleman know the names of these two officers? because I do.

Army Schoolmasters.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee relative to Army schoolmasters, arrangements have yet been made for an adequate supply of teachers for Army schools; will he say whether children attending any of these schools receive denominational instruction; and, if so, will he state how that instruction is controlled.

Mr. BRODRICK: The provision of an adequate supply of teachers depends on the creation of increased accommodation at the Duke of York's school, which is under consideration. A special examination, however, will be held in December to increase the supply of teachers. As regards the rest of the Question, ministers of any denomination belonging to places of worship to which the troops march on Sundays, or their authorised curates, are at liberty to attend at the school for an hour on one or two days a week to give religious instruction to children of their respective persuasions.

Coronation Medal for Soldiers Sent Home for the Coronation.

Major RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Regulars, who with the

Colonials were sent home from South Africa in the "Bavarian" for the Coronation, will, as well as the Colonials and Yeomanry, receive the Coronation medal.

MR. BRODRICK: The reply is in the negative. The Colonials were contingents duly accredited to this country to take part in the Coronation, which they subsequently did, and therefore received the medal. The Regulars and Yeomanry representative units, owing to the postponement, did not take part in the Coronation, and therefore did not receive the medal. It should be remembered that the Coronation medal is a personal gift from the King, and the War Office has no control over the distribution.

MAJOR RASCH: The men were duly selected, and it was not their fault that they were not present.

Army Reserve.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the present position of the Army Reserve, and the effect on the numbers of the Reserve of the new proposals for the re-engagement of time-expired men.

MR. BRODRICK: It would be very misleading to give any figures at the present moment, as many men are on furlough and have not yet joined the Reserve. The number of men who have rejoined the colours is at present very small. I hope to have approximately accurate figures as to the condition of the Reserve at the beginning of December.

Sanitation at Hong Kong.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has yet received the full Reports of the medical and sanitary experts, Professor Simpson and Mr. Robert Chadwick, who recently visited Hong Kong in connection with the plague; and will he say whether it is proposed to remove some of the slum property in the Chinese quarter of the city, with a view to secure improved drainage and sufficient ventilation.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative; no general scheme for the removal of insanitary property in Hong Kong is at present before me.

Congo Free State—Frontier Delimitation.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what reason has been assigned by the German Government for the forcible seizure in September, 1900, by a German force, of that portion of the Congo Free State which had been leased by King Leopold of Belgium to Great Britain in 1894, and which was subsequently abandoned by Great Britain in deference to French and German objections; and do His Majesty's Government propose to acquiesce in that seizure.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): As I have already explained to my hon. friend on June 2nd last, the information we have received from the German Government does not include any mention of the incidents referred to in the Question. A delimitation of frontier in the region referred to is undoubtedly in course of being carried out. We have no reason to believe that Congolese rights over territory contiguous to our Protectorate have been affected.

Great Britain and Germany—Secret Treaty.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether a secret treaty exists between Great Britain and Germany; and, if so, whether His Majesty's Government propose at some, and, if so, at what future time, to communicate its terms to Parliament.

LORD CRANBORNE: I am afraid I can only reply to my hon. friend to the same effect as in my answer upon the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, namely, that if there be such treaty, in the nature of the case I am precluded from communicating its terms. I hope that even if he finds this answer unsatisfactory, he will recognise that I can give no other.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The inevitable inference from this is that there is such a treaty.

Germany and South Africa—Portuguese Possessions.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government have made any treaty or convention or come to any agreement with Germany relative to Portuguese possessions in South Africa; if so, have the terms of any such treaty, convention, or agreement, been communicated to Portugal; and will they be communicated to this House, and when.

LORD CRANBORNE: My right hon. friend and predecessor replied to a similar Question by my hon. friend on 1st February, 1900.† If I assure my hon. friend that it is impossible for me to make a fuller reply than was given upon that occasion, I hope he will accept it.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: May I assume from that, that since that reply, no treaty engagements have been made with Germany in regard to Portuguese possessions in South Africa?

LORD CRANBORNE: I am afraid I must ask for notice.

Condition of European Turkey.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will now lay upon the Table copies of the Reports addressed to Sir Nicholas O'Conor during the past eighteen months by His Majesty's consular officers in Macedonia; and whether he is able to give any information as to communications addressed by the Powers to the Porte with reference to the condition of European Turkey.

LORD CRANBORNE: is Majesty's Government will consider whether the Papers mentioned can be presented. His Majesty's Government have urged on the Porte that while adequate measures should be taken for preventing disorders, anything in the nature of excessive or indiscriminate severity should be carefully avoided. They believe that similar advice has been given by other Powers.

Transvaal Loan.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether His Majesty's Government propose to introduce during this session a Bill guaranteeing a Transvaal loan; and, if so, can he state the purposes to which the proceeds of that loan are proposed to be applied.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): No, Sir, it is not proposed to introduce a Transvaal Loan Bill this session. When one is introduced, of course the information for which the hon. Gentleman asks will be given.

Registration Duty on Cereals.

MR. JASPER MORE (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether the registration duty on imported cereals is paid on the quarter or the hundredweight.

*MR. RITCHIE: If the hon. Member will look at the Schedule to the Finance Act, he will see that the duties on grain, etc., are calculated by the hundredweight.

Corn Returns.

MR. JASPER MORE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he is aware that farmers are anxious to have official returns of malting, as distinguished from grinding, barley; whether there is any objection to ordering this double return as well as the present average composed of both; and, whether the same separate returns could be given of the best wheat as well as of inferior wheat.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The suggestion made by my hon. friend is one which has frequently been considered, although I have not recently received any representations from agricultural organisations on the subject. It was found to be very difficult, as I think my hon. friend would agree, to draw any clear line of demarcation even between malting and grinding barley, and in the case of wheat there is only a mere graduation from good to inferior. The increased labour involved in the preparation of separate returns as proposed would moreover be very considerable, and legislation for the purpose of amending the Corn Returns Act would be necessary; but neither of them are insuperable objections if my hon. friend can show that the proposal is feasible and of real importance. As at present advised, I am afraid that it is not practicable for me to give effect to my hon. friend's proposals.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, lxxviii., 282.

Religious Tests for Post Office Servants.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General if his attention has been called to an advertisement in the *Belfast News Letter* of 13th September for a young lady (Presbyterian) to take full charge of telegraph (sounder instrument) and postal duties at Leenane, county Galway, will he say whether it is the rule of the Department that religious tests are not to be applied; and can he say what is the proportion of Presbyterians to Roman Catholics in the village in question.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): My attention was not called to the advertisement in question till I saw the hon. and learned Member's Question. I am making inquiry on the subject, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

London Telegraphists and the Royal Progress.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, in view of the fact that Saturday, 25th October, has been declared a Bank Holiday in London, he will state if he has decided to give the London telegraphists the same concessions on the day in question as were granted to them on Coronation Day.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir, the concessions granted will be the same as on Coronation Day. Telegraphists who are required to attend for duty on Saturday next within the County of London will receive either a day's pay or a day's leave at some future time.

Stornoway Mail Service.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he will state on how many occasions during the last three months the Stornoway mail steamer has been late in her arrival in Stornoway, and at Kyle and Mallaig on the return passage; will he say on how many occasions the delay has exceeded half-an-hour, and whether the penalty clause has ever been enforced; and, if not, will he explain why this has not been done.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: During July, August, and September last the mail steamer from Kyle reached Stornoway more than thirty minutes late nearly every day, but on nearly every occasion the mail train from the south was late in arriving at Kyle—frequently more than half-an-hour late. In the reverse direction the contract service ends at Kyle, and the steamer reached that place late on nine occasions only during the period in question, on seven of which the lateness exceeded half-an-hour. The penalty clause in the contract has not been enforced, as it was not considered to apply to the delays in question. At the same time, I am not satisfied with the manner in which the service has recently been performed, and I had already caused a communication to be addressed to the contractor on the subject.

Hospital Accommodation in Lewis District.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that a man named Graham recently died of typhus fever in the populous district of Ness, Island of Lewis, and that the body remained uncoffined for three days; will he state whether arrangements can be made for speedy interment in cases such as this; and, seeing that the only fever hospital is at Stornoway, thirty miles distant, will the Secretary for Scotland consider the expediency of arranging for this district to be provided with a place for the isolation of persons suffering from typhus and other infectious diseases.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM-MURRAY, Buteshire): The Local Government Board have ascertained that no person of the name of Graham has been notified as having died of typhus fever at Ness. They learn, however, that an old man named Mackay died in that district of typhus on the morning of Sunday the 14th September, that intimation of his death was conveyed to Stornoway the same evening, that on Monday morning instructions were wired to have a coffin prepared, that on Tuesday an undertaker was sent from Stornoway, twenty-six miles distant, as the local undertaker would not coffin the body, and that about two o'clock on the same day the remains were coffined under the personal supervision of the chairman of the local authority — all within fifty-six hours after the man's death. The Board are satisfied that, in the circumstances, the arrangements for interment could not have been more expeditiously carried out, and they are assured that the local authority have made arrangements for interring as speedily as possible in such cases. The question of hospital accommodation for the Lewis District is a very difficult one, and is engaging the attention of the local authority and the Local Government Board.

Crimes Act Prosecutions—Case of Thomas Maher.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been directed to a trial at Templemore, on 2nd October, at which two resident magistrates took part, when a week's imprisonment with hard labour was imposed in default of payment of a 5s. fine on Mr. Thomas Maher, a district councillor, for shouting "This is Sheridan's work"; and will he say on what grounds hard labour formed portion of the sentence on Mr. Maher.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): Mr. Thomas Maher was, on the 1st September, tried with ten others before a Bench consisting of two resident and five ordinary magistrates under the Towns Improvement Act for the offence of riotous and indecent behaviour in the public streets. All those charged other than Maher were acquitted; he was convicted and fined 5s., with 1s. 6d. costs, with seven days imprisonment in default of payment. Hard labour was not awarded at all, and the fine was paid on the 3rd instant.

*MR. DELANY (Queen's Co., Ossory): Will the right hon. Gentleman say what the indecent conduct consisted of?

MR. ATKINSON: No, Sir.

Hospital (Limerick) Roads.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the condition of the public road in the town of Hospital, County Limerick; and seeing that, since the late contract expired about four months ago, no repairs have been made to the road, and having regard to the condition of the road from Hospital to Knocklong, will he take steps to remedy the matter.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): It is the duty of County and District Councils, as the case may be, to keep all public works in good condition and repair, and to take all steps necessary for that purpose. The Local Government Board has power to take action with a view to remedy any default on the part of the local authority in the matter, provided complaint is made to the Board under Section 32 of the Local Government Act, 1898.

Labourers' Cottages in the Macroom Union.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork Co., Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an application by a labourer named William Creedon for a cottage and plot of land on the farm of Jeremiah Creedon, Parthanknuck, in the Ullanes electoral division of the Macroom Union, was sanctioned at a sworn inquiry held in April, 1901, and the site marked out and approved by the Engineering Inspector of the Local Government Board; and will he explain why the house was subsequently rejected although the applicant's present abode was condemned as unfit for habitation.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are not accurately stated in the first part of the Question. The Inspector disapproved of the site selected for the cottage, and the District Council was so informed. The case cannot now be re-opened, the Provisional Order having been made absolute; but it will be open to the Council to renew the application, in respect of another site, when proposing a fresh scheme.

Hard Labour Sentences under the Crimes Act.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the addition of hard labour to a sentence of imprisonment inflicted under The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, carrying with it prohibition of service on any local body for five years, it is intended to continue to inflict such addition to sentences for political offences on local representatives.

MR. WYNDHAM: The disqualification is statutory in Ireland, as in England, under the Local Government Acts applicable to the two countries. Sentences within the limits prescribed by the Criminal Law and Procedure Act of 1887 are imposed by resident magistrates subject to revision on appeal by County Court judges. Those who act in either of these judicial capacities impose sentences in accordance with the gravity of each particular offence proved to have been committed. I decline to accept the suggestion that they harbour any intentions of a general character.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in many cases this effect of imposing hard labour has been pointed out to the magistrates?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Have not two removable magistrates actually announced that they did not know this was the law of Ireland?

[No answer was returned.]

Irish Executions—Rules.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the new rules which he has issued for regulating the execution of capital sentences in Ireland, the rule which requires that the executioners shall remain in the prison after the execution, and until permission is given them to leave, is intended to give power to the sheriff, the coroner, or the governor, or to any other person, and, if so, to whom, to detain the executioners for attendance at the inquest should their presence be required by the coroner; and, if not, whether, in view of the fact that executioners on two occasions in Cork disregarded the summons of the coroner to appear and give evidence, he will see that powers are given the coroners to detain executioners and compel them to give evidence if required.

MR. WYNDHAM: These rules are identical in all respects with the rules which obtain in this country. I see no reason for enlarging their scope. The coroner is the only person who can compel an executioner to appear at an inquest, but, under paragraph 5 of the rules, he can be held at the disposal of the coroner by the prison governor.

*MR. DELANY: Will the right hon. Gentleman say if he proposes to hang many Irish Members?

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in two cases in Cork, although the coroner desired the attendance of the executioner, the sheriff had sent him away to England, and he refused to come back? Seeing that the law has not been carried out, and that there is no record of how the convicts died, will the right hon. Gentleman at least give us some guarantee that unfortunate people are not executed with undue severity?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think there is any need to make a special rule for Irish coroners which does not apply to English coroners.

Case of Mr. O'Flanagan, J.P.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is intended to hold a sworn inquiry into the case of Mr. O'Flanagan, J.P., Chairman of the District Council of Cordfin, who was recently sentenced to four months imprisonment with hard labour under The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, and who is now an inmate of a lunatic asylum.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have no objection to a sworn inquiry into the prison discipline of Limerick Prison, or the sanitation of that prison, or the medical treatment which Mr. O'Flanagan received, whether in prison prior to his falling ill, or in the county infirmary, where symptoms of typhoid were developed, provided that the hon. and gallant Member will indicate whether he desires the inquiry to be directed to any or all of these questions, or to others. I should, however, say that I have a report from Dr. Woodhouse, the Medical Member of the General Prisons Board, dated September 18th, which deals with the circumstances of Mr. O'Flanagan's illness and its melancholy consequences, and also a report of an inquiry in August by the Medical Inspector of the Local Government Board on the outbreak of typhoid fever in the city of Limerick. I am prepared to lay these on the Table of the House, since the hon. and gallant Member may consider, on reading them, that a case for further inquiry does not arise. I have no objection to a further sworn inquiry.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in view of the extreme gravity of this case, and the great excitement it has caused in the neighbourhood from which Mr. O'Flanagan comes, he will have the inquiry held without delay?

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.): And will the Press be admitted?

Mr. WYNDHAM: All the facts are contained in the two reports I have referred to. I have said I have no objection to a sworn inquiry if one is desired.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: But will it be held without delay?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I must first have a specific statement of the points on which inquiry is desired. I have suggested four of them, but if the hon. Member has others in mind perhaps he will put a Question down and I will consider it.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: We want the whole case inquired into, the circumstances connected with the outbreak of typhoid, the prison treatment of the man, his condition at the time he was received, and in fact everything connected with it.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have said that I have not the slightest objection.

Mr. POWER: What about publicity?

Captain DONELAN: Will the inquiry be open to the Press and the public?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am not aware of that. I will do my best to secure the utmost publicity in regard to the circumstances of this case, a publicity which I should welcome, as a great deal of prejudice has been aroused which I should like to see dispelled.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Who is to hold the inquiry?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order. The Question has been fully answered.

Sentences under the Crimes Act.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland how many Members of this House were sentenced to terms of imprisonment with hard labour, by Courts sitting under The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act of 1887 between July in that year and September, 1892. How many Members have been sentenced to hard labour by such courts from November, 1901, to the present time. How many persons have been sentenced by such courts to further terms of imprisonment in default of giving bail to be of good behaviour between 1887 and November, 1892, and of these how many were Members of this House. And how many persons have been sentenced to further terms in default of bail since November, 1901, and of these how many were Members of this House.

MR. WYNDHAM: Parliamentary Paper No. 158 of 1889 shows that up to May 16th of that year two Members of this House, Mr. Thomas Condon (East Tipperary) and Mr. Edward Harrington were sentenced to two months imprisonment with hard labour (7th February, 1889) and six months with hard labour (31st December, 1888) respectively. A third Member, Dr. Tanner, was sentenced to hard labour on July 29th, 1889. I have, on my present information, no reason to believe that hard labour was imposed on any hon. Member at a later date. From November, 1901, to the present time, six hon. Members have been sentenced to hard labour by the Court of First Instance. In two cases the hard labour was remitted on appeal. The appeals in the other four cases are pending. In reply to the third paragraph, the number of persons sentenced to further terms of imprisonment, in default of giving bail, between 1887 and 1892, was 106, of whom two (Mr. William O'Brien, Cork City, August 26th, 1889, and Mr. Gilhooly, Cork West, same date) were Members of this House. Since November, 1901, thirty persons have been sentenced to further terms in default of bail, and of these five are Members of Parliament. In the case of one Member the further term was remitted on appeal.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Does the right hon. Gentleman adhere to his figures of 1,601 given the other day?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, applicable to all persons, including Members of Parliament.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: In view of the fact that it happened that all the removable magistrates began exactly at the same time to give hard labour, will the right hon. Gentleman state on what date he issued instructions to them to do so?

*MR. SPEAKER: I hope hon. Members will allow Questions to proceed. That Question does not arise out of the Question on the Paper, and notice must be given of it.

MR. WYNDHAM: Sir, may I, as a matter of personal explanation, beg leave to say that I utterly repudiate the suggestion that I gave any such instructions? [NATIONALIST cries: "It is true."

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: What about your agent?

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): Can the right hon. Gentleman explain the discrepancy— [MINISTERIAL cries of "Order."]

*MR. SPEAKER: Order order! The Question on the Paper has been fully answered. If the hon. Member wishes for further particulars, he can put down a Question on the subject. I quite understand that this subject excites deep interest among hon. Members below the gangway, but still I hope that they will remember the Rule that Questions must be relevant to, and arise out of, the Question on the Paper.

MR. O'SHEE: Mr. Speaker, kindly allow me to put my Question, and if it is not in order, I will bow to your ruling.

*MR. SPEAKER: After what I have said, I will trust that the hon. Member will not put a Question which does not really arise.

MR. O'SHEE: Can the right hon. Gentleman explain the discrepancy between the number of Members of this House asked to give bail in addition to the sentence of hard labour imposed on them in the period from 1887 to 1892, and the period from November last to the present time?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is an argument arising upon the answer; it is asking for an explanation of the facts, or what the hon. Member thinks are the facts.

Blacksod Bay.

DR. ROBERT AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the agreement arrived at between the British and Canadian Governments, whereby a subsidy of £225,000 a year for ten years

(£75,000 a year from the British Government and £150,000 a year from the Canadian Government) is to be given for the purpose of subsidising a line of steamers running between Liverpool and Canada, and seeing that Blacksod Bay, in the West of Ireland, is the nearest point in the United Kingdom to Canada, he will use his influence with the Government with a view to making Blacksod Bay a port of call for, at least, the mails between Canada and Great Britain.

MR. WYNDHAM: No such agreement has been concluded.

Rae Estate, Killorglin.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the inspector who visited the Rae Estate, Killorglin, county Kerry, has yet made his report; and whether he can state what is the cause of the delay in the sale of this estate.

MR. WYNDHAM: The report has been made to the Land Commissioners, who are now considering the report to be made by them to the Land Judge.

Sergeant Sullivan, Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland where is Sergeant Sullivan, who was tried for perjury, now stationed; and what is his present rank in the Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. WYNDHAM: At Dunshaughlin, Co. Meath, with the rank of sergeant.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is it a promotion? What grade of sergeant is he in at present?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member will see that does not arise. The Question was where is he stationed, and what is his rank.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Yes, Sir; but I understand that there are three grades of sergeant, and I want to know which is Sullivan's grade. Is it the same as when he was charged with perjury in the West of Ireland, or has he been promoted?

MR. WYNDHAM: If the hon. Member wants knowledge as to the distinctions in rank, he must put down a Question.

*MR. DELANY: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will promote Sullivan to the position of removable magistrate, for which he is eminently qualified?

Irish Affairs—Nationalist Demand for a General Discussion.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is yet in a position to say if he will provide time for the discussion of the grave state of Ireland asked for by the Irish Members; and, if so, when.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Perhaps I may be allowed to intervene, with a view of facilitating the action of the right hon. Gentleman. I had the opportunity of stating on Monday what my view of this matter is, and I said that I cordially supported the claim of the Irish Members. The right hon. Gentleman, as I understand him, on this Irish question, which is not, of course, exclusively, but certainly supremely Irish, declines to give a day for discussion on the mere request of the Irish Members, and will only give it if a Scotchman or an Englishman asks him for it. As I am possessed of that qualification [Cries of "Which?"] I am glad to join in making the request.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The right hon. Gentleman does indeed appear to have facilitated my answer to the hon. Gentleman. He is mistaken, however, in supposing that I refused a day to the Irish Members because they were Irish Members, or that I am prepared to give it to the right hon. Gentleman because he happens to be a Scotchman. I give it to the right hon. Gentleman because he speaks, as I understand him, as Leader of the Opposition, and on behalf, not of a section of hon. Gentlemen opposite, but of those hon. Gentlemen as a whole, as a body in this House. The right hon. Gentleman desires that there should be a Motion put down on the Paper and discussed, which of course from the very nature of the case would be a Vote of Censure, and under those circumstances I am ready, as I have always expressed myself ready, to give the opportunity which the right hon. Gentleman desires. I suppose, perhaps, a week's notice should be given, and this day week would be a convenient day. A Vote of Censure is sufficiently important not to be taken without some notice, and subject to anything the right hon. Gentleman may have to say I shall propose to devote this day week to the Resolution he desires to move.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: May I be allowed to say that while, of course, we accept the time the right hon. Gentleman is going to give us, we do not concede our right, as representatives of Ireland, to claim to get time for the discussion of the affairs of that country.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman seems to think that there is some special disability in this matter attaching to Irish Members. I can assure him he has entirely misinterpreted everything that I have said and thought on the subject. I should equally have declined to give a day to any section of hon. Gentlemen opposite unless it had been understood——

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: We are a distinct Party; we are no section. We represent a nation.

Mr. CONDON (Tipperary, E): We are a Party; we are not a section.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: For the word "section" I would substitute the word "fraction." I should equally have declined to give a day to any fraction of hon. Gentlemen opposite unless it had been supported by the official Opposition. I give it because it has been asked for by the Leader of the Opposition, who proposes to move a Vote of Censure.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No. All I do is—I might almost say, at the instigation and the solicitation of the right hon. Gentleman—to join in asking for a day for the discussion of this matter. The Motion properly and naturally comes from the representatives of Ireland. With regard to fixing a particular day, will the right hon. Gentleman reserve the matter for a final decision?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I will certainly reserve it, but there seems to be a little ambiguity and difficulty introduced into the discussion by the last remark of the right hon. Gentleman. Of course, it would not be proper for me to dictate who is to move the Resolution. That is a matter entirely to be settled by the Opposition themselves. But it must be distinctly understood that the right hon. Gentleman does not simply come forward as an *amicus curiæ*, merely because he wants to see a discussion take place; it must be understood that the Motion is arranged under his auspices; that it is in the nature of a condemnation of the Government; and that it is officially supported by the right hon. Gentleman.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: What I have asked for, and continue to ask for, is that an opportunity should be afforded to the Irish Members to challenge the administration of affairs in Ireland, and to the Government to make a statement of the reasons which have led them to adopt the steps which they are now following in Ireland. Then the House can pronounce its opinion upon the subject.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I really think the right hon. Gentleman had better make up his mind.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): You had better make up yours.

Mr. MACVEAGH: This is not a debating society.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it would be for everybody's convenience that there should be a clear issue on this point, and if the right hon. Gentleman cannot go further—if he really cannot take the full plunge this afternoon—I think we had better defer this.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman, departing, I think, somewhat from his usual courtesy, taxed me with not having made up my mind, when I have not altered my statement or opinion from the first. What

I have done I have described to the House. The right hon. Gentleman having stated that he would not give this day, which I think ought to be given, at the instance of the Irish Members, I am willing to do them and the House and the public and the good government of Ireland the service of joining in asking for a day. The Motion will be an Irish Motion, and it will be for the House to pronounce its opinion upon it.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that the last thing I wanted to do was to show discourtesy to him, and if anything I have said can be so interpreted I was quite unconscious of it, and I at once withdraw and apologise. But may I again repeat exactly what I feel the circumstances to be? It is, so far as the Government and this side of the House are concerned, a matter of complete indifference whether the Resolution, for which, if it be a Vote of Censure, I am prepared to give time, is moved by an Irish Member or by the right hon. Gentleman himself, or any one on the Front Bench. If I may offer an opinion, I think it possible that the most convenient course would be that an Irish Member should move it, as being especially acquainted with that side of the case. But that is no affair of mine. What is an affair of mine—and the right hon. Gentleman will see that I am really doing this in the interests of what I regard as the general principles of Parliamentary practice—is that it should be understood that, whoever moves the Motion, it should be adopted by the Opposition as a whole, not by every individual, of course, but by the Opposition as a whole, that it is in the nature of a direct condemnation of the conduct of the Government, and that it is supported officially by right hon. Gentlemen on that Bench.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I only wish to say that I entirely repudiate, on behalf of my hon. friends, the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman that we must submit our Motion to the censorship, the revision, or the approval of any Party in this House, and I am perfectly sure that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition will put forward no such preposterous and insulting demand. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House has apologised for any discourtesy as unintentional in his language towards the Leader of the Opposition. May I say that he has, I think, quite unintentionally, employed towards us, and, which is more important, our country, most insulting language. We claim to be a nation, and we regard the use of such words as "section" or "faction," as a deliberate insult to a nation whose civilisation, I may say, preceded and may also succeed that of this country.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I appear to be very unfortunate in my expressions. I think the hon. Gentleman will see, if he will permit me to explain, that the very last meaning my words were susceptible of was the suggestion of insult to himself, his friends, or his country. I was trying to describe what I conceived to be the proper course for the Opposition as a whole. Talking of the Opposition as a whole, I described the representatives from Ireland as a section. [Nationalist cries: "You said 'faction'"] whereupon the hon. Member for Cork interrupted me with great vehemence and repudiated the phrase "section." Thereupon I cast about me for a more neutral phrase, and I used a word which, at all events in my school days, I never thought had a political, religious, or specially national reference. The word was "fraction" [Nationalist cries: "You said 'faction.'"] Ever since I have been connected with fractions at school I have thought the word purely neutral in its reference. I used it on this occasion because it simply connotes the fact that eighty Irish Gentlemen are only a certain portion of the total number of the Opposition, which amounts, I think, to about 260. The date of the civilisation of Ireland, which I entirely agree with the hon. Gentleman preceded that of this barbaric country, really does not invalidate the fact that eighty is only a fraction of 260. I can assure the hon. Gentleman that nothing but that pure statement of fact was intended to be implied by what I said.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: I said I did not think the right hon. Gentleman intended discourtesy; I only said that his language must be regarded by us as insulting language which could not be allowed to pass without protest. But

I wish to put to the right hon. Gentleman what is really a much more important matter than his language—are we or are we not, after this tangled conversation, to understand that the right hon. Gentleman refuses to the representatives of Ireland a day for the discussion of the exercise of coercion in their country?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hoped that I had been lucid in my explanation, and that there was hardly anything to be added. I am perfectly ready to give a day to the Opposition for the discussion of a Motion condemnatory of the Government's Irish policy. I did not ask that that Motion should be placed in the hands of an English Member, or even seen by an English Member, or subjected to revision by the right hon. Gentleman, or to any of the processes to which the hon. Gentleman appears to object; all I say is that it must be put on the Paper as a Motion of the Opposition as a whole, and intended to be supported by them as a whole.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I may recall to the right hon. Gentleman the familiar lines:—

> "The Spanish fleet thou canst not see—because
> It is not yet in sight."

This Motion is not in sight. I do not know what Motion may be made by the Irish Members; and he invites those sitting in this part of the House to pledge themselves to support a Motion of the terms of which they are totally ignorant. No, Sir, I stand by what I have said already. We think it is the duty of the Government to give this day. We think it is scandalous that it should be refused; and we shall form our opinion upon the case made out by the Irish Members and the Government respectively.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: May I suggest that it is about time to drop the subject? If we are not going to get a day given to us, it is just possible that we may be able to take it.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. gentleman is perfectly at liberty to do anything consistent with the Rules of the House. As regards the observations from the right hon. Gentleman opposite, would not the best course be, in these circumstances, to wait till the Resolution is put down on the Paper, and then he can inform me and the House of the view which he takes?

*Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the House that there is no Question before it.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Then I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether he has observed that the President of the United States of America has addressed a message of sympathy to the United Irish League Convention at Boston, and whether, in view of the future relations between this country and America, he can make any announcement that this country is not indisposed to learn wisdom as to Irish affairs from President Roosevelt, as the head of a great friendly nation—the greatest nation in the world.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL rose.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! This discussion must cease.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I must press for an answer today.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I followed the hon. Member's Question. It is not a Question that was in order or could have been put on the Paper. It is not a Question asking for information.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: On the question of order, Mr. Speaker, allow me to submit that a message by the President of the United States—[Interruption]—you are not going to closure the President of the United States here. [Renewed interruption.] I submit that this message——

*Mr. SPEAKER: I appeal to hon. Members on both sides of the House to let me at least hear what the hon. Gentleman is going to say.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Thank you, Sir. I was about to submit to you that this message of the President of the United States of America is an international fact of the first importance to the future of this country, and that it would not be a friendly thing to the head of a great nation like the Americans that his message should be treated as if the disposition were to avenge his insult to the Chief Secretary and to his "removables" in Ireland.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is entitled to consider the matter important, but it is not the subject-matter of a Question at Question time.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I beg, then, to ask leave of the House to move the adjournment for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance—*videlicet*, the important question as to the future relations between this country and the United States raised by the message of President Roosevelt to the convention of the United Irish League in Boston.

*MR. SPEAKER: I am precluded by the Standing Orders from accepting that Motion for the Adjournment. I am prohibited from accepting any Motion which is not a definite matter of urgent public importance. The relations between this country and the United States of America are not a definite matter. They might cover an immensely wide field of argument. If the hon. Member were to look at the precedents he would find that Motions of that description have always been refused from the Chair under the Standing Order.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: May I respectfully put it to you that the Motion does not deal with the general relations of this country and the United States, but with a definite matter?

*MR. SPEAKER: I have just decided that point, and I have no doubt as to the correctness of my view. I cannot allow the subject to be re-opened. I assure the hon. Member I am always ready to accept any Motion from any quarter of the House which is in conformity with the Standing Order.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: The fault is none of yours, Mr. Speaker, but I hope it will be noted in America that American opinion and Irish opinion are closured and gagged in this House.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman say what the business will be tomorrow night?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Tomorrow, both at the morning and evening sitting, we shall discuss education; also on Friday.

NEW BILL.

INNKEEPERS' LIABILITY BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the Liability of Innkeepers," presented by Mr. Broadhurst, under Standing Order No. 31; supported by Mr. Gretton, Mr. Bousfield, Sir Brampton Gurdon, Mr. Levy, Mr. Seely, and Sir John Brunner; to be read a second time tomorrow, and to be printed. [Bill 299.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

(3.0) MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) moved—

"In page 3, line 7, after 'conditions,' to insert 'and provisions.'"

The right hon. Gentleman said that 'provisions" appeared to be the more appropriate term as far as some of the items were concerned.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) formally moved—

"In page 3, line 7, after 'conditions,' to insert 'are complied with.'"

Amendment agreed to.

MR. BRYCE had on the Paper the following Amendment—

"In page 3, line 7, at end, insert—(*a*) The managers or trustees of any school which, by its trust deed, is to be used for the purposes of instruction as an elementary school shall transfer the school buildings to the local education authority either by way of lease for a term of years renewable for ever or absolutely, pursuant to Section 23 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, and shall not be entitled to receive any consideration for such transfer other than a nominal rent by way of acknowledgment in case such buildings are transferred by lease. Provided that such managers or trustees may reserve, out of such transfer, to trustees to be nominated by them for that purpose, the use of the school buildings when the same are not being used for school purposes, and may provide for the giving of any religious instruction, over and above that which may be given by the teachers, either before the opening or after the close, or both before the opening and after the close, of the ordinary school hours under the direction either of the last hereinbefore mentioned trustees or of such person or persons as the last-mentioned trustees may from time to time appoint."

*The CHAIRMAN: said that this Amendment was not in order, because it would negative what has gone before. The local education authority are to maintain the schools on certain conditions, but the first condition the right hon. Gentleman proposes to insert is that the schools should cease to exist.

Mr. BRYCE said that the Amendment need not necessarily carry that interpretation. He was dealing simply with the question of the property in the schools, and the Amendment did not raise the question which the Chairman seemed to apprehend.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said that the phrase "provided by" was accepted, subject to a definition to be inserted later.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) said he desired, on a point of order, to submit that the Amendment was inconsistent with words which had been already passed. They were now dealing with schools not provided by the local authority, and the effect of the Amendment, which referred specifically to Section 23 of the Act of 1870, would be to make such schools provided schools.

Mr. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea, District) said he did not think that the Attorney General could justify the point he had taken. There was nothing in the Amendment which affected the trust under which the property was held by the trustees. It was really a question as to where the legal estate in the schools should be vested; and, therefore, he submitted that the Amendment was in order.

*The CHAIRMAN: I do not agree with the hon. Gentleman, because the Amendment states that any school, which by its trust deed is to be used for the purposes of instruction as an elementary school, shall be used for other purposes. It seems to me as if I had undertaken to keep something alive on certain conditions, and that the first condition I proposed was that it should be killed.

Mr. BRYCE said that the Amendment would not have that effect. It provided that the buildings should continue to be held under the trust, but in the particular manner indicated. There was nothing more in the Amendment than was in Section 23 of the Act of 1870.

*The CHAIRMAN: I think it would convert non-provided schools into provided schools.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) asked if the Amendment would not be in order if it read that the managers "shall, if the local authority think fit." That would give the local authority power to exercise an option, and if the option were not exercised the Amendment would be necessary.

Mr. BRYCE said he would be prepared to accept that Amendment to his Amendment.

*The CHAIRMAN: I think that would be a very fine difference. It seems to me it would be ridiculous, when defining the conditions under which a school is to be kept alive, to propose as the first condition that it should cease to exist.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he saw that point, and accepted the ruling of the Chair with reference to it. The Amendment of his right hon. friend, according to the ruling of the Chair, was, in effect, that the schools should be extinguished; but the proposal he (Mr. Lloyd-George) proposed to submit was an entirely different one. It was simply to give to the local authority the option of taking over the schools, not that the schools should be extinguished. In that case the provision would be necessary in order to conduct the schools not taken over.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that if the Amendment were accepted, it would give the local authority the option of not maintaining, but destroying, the non-provided schools.

MR. BRYCE said that his Amendment intended that non-provided schools should be maintained. The Amendment which he desired to move only related to the building—it related to nothing but the building. Consequently, what the Committee had already determined with regard to provided schools did not touch this point.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think that if there is to be an option in the local education authority the option ought to be inserted after the words "local education authority." We had a discussion as to whether there should be an option or not when the discussion took place on the question to leave out "shall" and insert "may," and the Committee decided that there should be no option.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) said the Amendment standing in the name of his hon. friend the Member for the Otley Division which he proposed to move dealt with an important point, and ought to have the consideration of the House. It was—

> "In page 3, line 7, at end insert—(*a*) If the managers of any such school shall not fulfil the conditions which must be fulfilled in order that the annual Parliamentary grant may be obtained, the liability of the local education authority to maintain such school shall cease, and such school shall no longer be deemed to be a public elementary school."

But, before moving that Amendment, he desired to ask, upon a point of order, whether the raising of this question here would prevent the subsequent discussion which might take place upon an Amendment, which was put down upon the Paper to come in at the end of the Clause, as to the general penalties to be imposed for failing to comply with any of the conditions in Clause 8. He raised that point of order because he did not wish to exclude the discussion on sub-Section 2.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Which Amendment is the hon. Gentleman referring to?

*MR. CORRIE GRANT said he referred to the last Amendment but one on page 42 of the White Paper, standing in the name of the hon. Member for Rossendale, namely—

> "In page 3, line 35, at end, add—(4) If the persons providing the school make default in performing the duties imposed upon them by sub-section (1) (*d*) of this section, the local authority may, with the consent of the Board of Education, undertake the discharge of such duties, and shall be entitled thereafter, so long as they shall think fit, to use the school buildings and premises for the purposes of a public elementary school, paying nevertheless for such use to the persons providing the school a fair rent, to be determined in case of dispute by the Board of Education, and the school shall thenceforth be deemed to have been provided by the local education authority."

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is quite clear that it would be useless to have the discussion twice over, but I must leave the hon. Member to decide whether he takes the discussion now or later. So far as the point of order goes, I see no objection to moving that if certain things are not conditions they shall be made so.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the Committee had already passed words providing that the liability to maintain existed only so long as these conditions were complied with.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) called attention to the fact that he also had an Amendment down on page 38 of the Paper dealing with the same matter.

MR. DUNCAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Otley) said that, as the Amendment proposed to be moved by his hon. friend the Member for Rugby stood in his name, he would like to say that, as he understood, the conditions which had been discussed on a previous occasion were not quite the same as those in the Amendment which he had put down, but related rather to the conditions to be observed for obtaining the Parliamentary grant.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY explained that this matter also was dealt with, because the Committee passed the words "public elementary schools," and under the Act of 1870 a school ceased to be a public elementary school if the conditions necessary to obtain the grant were not observed.

*The CHAIRMAN: That is the law as it at present exists. If a school does not fulfil the conditions necessary in order to obtain the Parliamentary grant it ceases to be a public elementary school; therefore the Amendment is unnecessary.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) submitted that the present position was that if a school violated the conditions necessary for obtaining the Parliamentary grant it did not get the grant. What happened then was that the local authority was still liable to maintain it, and the fine was upon the ratepayers, who lost the grant but had still to maintain the school.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said the words of the Section already passed made it obligatory for the local authority to maintain public elementary schools. If the conditions were not observed the school ceased to be a public elementary school.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) said the school would not cease to be a public elementary school simply because it lost its grant.

Sir WILLIAM MATHER (Lancashire, Rossendale) said his Amendment carried the question much further. It provided that if a school did not obtain its grant it should still be maintained by the local authority, and so become a school provided by the authority.

*The CHAIRMAN: That does not arise out of this Amendment. This Amendment does not alter the present state of the law, and if it does not alter the present state of the law it appears to be unnecessary. The first Amendment in the name of the hon. Member for the Sowerby Division ought to come up as a separate question. The second Amendment has been already determined by Clause 7. The next Amendment on the Paper has also been determined by Amendment made. Then, there is an Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Rugby to insert, at the end of line 7,

> "(*a*) The managers of the school shall make provision to the satisfaction of the local education authority for religious instruction based upon reading of the Bible: provided that no religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught or used."

The Committee has already decided that the local authorities have no control over religious instruction.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE asked would it be in order for the hon. Member to move the second part of the Amendment. The first part had been disposed of but not the second, and he submitted that it would be in order to move the second part.

*The CHAIRMAN: The local education authority would have to decide whether any "religious catechism or religious formulary" was used. That would give the control. It ought not to be inserted here.

Mr. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said it had nowhere been decided that there should not be control over religious instruction.

*The CHAIRMAN: That question was raised and debated on a Motion made to leave out the word "secular."

Mr. M'KENNA said that that would be complete control over religious instruction. What was proposed here was partial control.

*The CHAIRMAN: The debate was taken upon the question whether religious and secular instruction were both to be under the control of the local authority.

(3.25.) Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) said he rose to move the Amendment of which he had given notice, because he thought sub-Section (*a*) raised the point upon which they came to close quarters as to what was the position of the managers under this Bill. The number of managers was settled by Clause 7, but there was no definition there of the things they had power to do and what they had not power to do. That was intended to be settled by Clause 8, but the structure of the Bill had been altered by the reconstruction of Clause 7. As the Clause originally stood there was a reference to the position of the managers under the Act of 1870, but that had now disappeared from the Bill, and therefore there was no indication that the managers under the Bill were in any respect in the situation of the managers under the Act of 1870. The Act of 1870 gave no particular powers to the managers, who were usually the proprietors of the schools, and they were only in the position of private persons who earned grants by the fulfilment of the conditions proposed. The situation was now altogether altered. The managers admittedly were not managers in the sense that was understood under the Act of 1870, and it was to be regretted that the word "managers" should have been applied in this case. These persons were a totally different class of persons, with different attributes and different duties altogether. What the Committee desired to know exactly was, what were the powers of these managers, and what were their duties, and whether they had any powers or duties except those contained in Section 8. The practical working of the Bill, especially in the rural districts, would depend entirely upon the managers. Anyone who considered the character and situation of the rural schools was bound to see that the management must be conducted by the people on the spot. The education authority would meet in the county town, many miles from most of the rural schools. The Committee who were to be the legislative authority of the County Council would also in all probability meet in the county town; they could not be distributed among the thousands of rural parishes. The direction of the business of the schools would therefore have to be done by the managers. What he wanted to know was in whose hands that management was to be. With reference to the provided schools, it was entirely in the hands of the education authority, as that authority would appoint its own managers and masters. But in half the schools of England, according to the Bill, the management was not to be in the hands of persons appointed by the education authority. In his speech at Manchester, the First Lord of the Treasury, referring to the existing state of education, asked what any foreign nation would think of such a system. They would, of course, object to any system under which half the elementary schools in the country were private concerns, but they would be even more astonished that when the Government were setting up a national system of public education they did not give the education authority the right to appoint the managers and teachers in the schools. That, however, was the system proposed by the Bill. In half the elementary schools in the country the education authority, so far from having any general control, was so constituted that, in regard to religious education, it was to have no control at all. A statutory majority of the managers, appointed entirely outside the national education authority, was to deal with the question of religious education, and the education authority, both in its entirety and through its representative upon the management, was to have nothing to say in the matter. Sub-Clause (*a*) dealt with the managers and secular education, and the Committee were told that in regard to secular education the managers were to be under the control of the education authority. But how would the scheme actually work? The education authority was to have one representative out of six on the management. The remaining five were not to be under its control at all, and yet the education authority was said to have sole control of the secular education. The first question he desired to ask was, as the education authority was to have no right of interference with religious education, what right or authority were the private managers to have over secular education? What was to be their function in the matter? The Attorney General had said the managers would act as a whole. If they acted as a whole they would place the education authority in a statutory minority. Was it intended that the managers, who were in no respect under the appointment of the education authority, should interfere with secular education? That was really a critical question when they came to consider the meaning of the assertion that the control of secular education was in the hands of the education authority, and it was one upon which everybody wanted to be informed. This authority was not derived from anything that formerly existed, because in former times these were private venture schools, receiving certain grants on certain conditions, but in all other respects entirely their own masters. That, professedly, was not to be the case in future. There was to be a national system under a central education authority. The only way in which the education authority could have complete control was through its own agents or representatives. That control was impossible if the work was to be carried on through agents, with regard to whom the education authority had no executive power or power of dismissal. That complete control ought to be in the hands of managers representing the education authority, whereas it was obvious on the face of the Bill itself that the control was in the hands of persons not representative of the authority. But let the Committee consider how the scheme would work. The education authority would give instructions to its representatives on the management to propose certain things in regard to secular education. Suppose the management by its majority refused to accept those directions, by what right could that statutory majority dispute the instructions? By sub-Section 2 any dispute between the managers and the authority was to be referred to the Board of Education, so that the right of the managers to dispute the directions was assumed. But if the sole control of secular education was to be in the education authority, what right had those who were not representatives of that authority to interfere in the matter at all? Secular education was the main business of the school, religious education being confined to a very limited portion of school hours. If in regard to that secular education the local authority was to have undisputed and indisputable control, what were the other managers to do during the greater part of the day? What voice or authority were they to have? If the Bill intended to give the sole control to the education authority, the other managers had no business or authority whatever during the main portion of school hours. That was the religious education with which they did not allow the education authority to interfere. By what right were those persons to interfere in secular education which the Government said was to be entirely at the disposal and under the control of the education authority, and therefore their representatives and agents? The other managers were not the agents of the education authority at all. It was said that they were to carry out the instructions given to them, but those instructions ought to be carried out by the persons who were the usual channel of instruction. This involved the daily work of the secular education of the school, upon which questions would arise and must arise. He was aware that the First Lord of the Treasury had put down an Amendment in the following terms—

> "Where the managers of a school fail to carry out any direction of the local education authority under this section as to the secular instruction to be given in the school, that authority shall, in addition to their other powers, have the power themselves to carry out the direction in question as if they were the managers."

The only way in which the education authority could carry out such a direction would be for them to carry it out themselves, as if they were the managers. How were they to carry out such a direction except by an agent or a representative of their own? Who was to determine whether the managers of the school had failed to carry out that direction? How was that going to be ascertained? Was this Amendment to supersede sub-Section 2, because that sub-Section allowed a dispute to be raised upon the question of whether the directions were or were not right which were given by the education authority to the managers, and that was to go to the Education Department at Whitehall. What right had the managers to raise the question at all? If the education authority was supreme, then the directions of the representative of that authority ought to be unquestioned. When this Bill was first launched, it was said that the education authority would have sole control, and that they would be able to bring public opinion to bear as against the action of the majority of the managers, but calling public opinion to bear against the executive was not having sole control. Therefore, the whole conception of this proposal was contrary to the idea of control being given to the education authority. He had put this Amendment down in order that they might have a clear statement from the

Government of what they considered to be the rights, if any, of intervention or interference on the part of any of those managers, except the representative of the Education Department with regard to secular education. There was another point which he thought had not yet received a satisfactory explanation, and that was how far the Education Department under their Code would still govern secular education in those schools. They had not yet had a clear statement upon that point. The late representative of the Education Department in this House said it was a very good thing that each education authority should form its own opinion as to the subjects to be taught. If that were so, he should like to have a clear answer upon it. In answer to an observation reminding the right hon. Gentleman of a statement he made in a speech at Bradford, he said that he wanted the education authority to have a variety in their subjects, but the Education Department would fix the standard. But supposing that the education authority fixed a very low list of subjects, was the Education Department in London to interfere with regard to the subjects taught as well as in the standards to be applied to the subjects? That was a very important matter, upon which they had not yet had any information. He wanted to know whether the authority of the representative of the education authority was to be as exclusive in respect of secular education as the authority of the denominational managers in respect of religious education? With regard to secular education, was the main business of the schools to be conducted solely under the direction of the education authority? That seemed to him to be the only condition which fulfilled the statement made by the Government which enabled them to have entire control in secular matters. Upon this Amendment he thought they ought to arrive at some conclusion on that subject, and he specially wished to know the effect under sub-Section 2 of this Clause. The right hon. Gentleman had studied sub-Section 2, and he had begun to see some difficulty in it which had induced him to put down his Amendment on page 40. He must have seen that if sub-Section 2 meant what it said, it allowed the managers, or a majority of the managers, to question upon every subject the instructions of the education authority and report to Whitehall. They had been told that this only referred to questions of secular education which trenched upon religious education. That was a very large subject. He had always regarded with the highest respect and admiration the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Education Department, but he was the child of the champion of denominationalism, and before he sat on the Front Bench he was a convinced denominationalist. That would be a great advantage to the denominational managers in matters of this kind. There was the further question of the instructions of the Education Department with regard to secular education. That was a question upon which they ought to have a distinct declaration. It seemed to him that such a proceeding as he had alluded to was absolutely inconsistent with the declaration in Clause 5 of the Bill that the education authority was to be responsible for and have control of all secular education in public elementary schools. If the Government intended that the majority of the denominational managers was to have any voice whatever in the secular instruction and management of the school, it would be an absolute contravention of the declaration in Clause 5, and the instruction to them to carry out directions of the local education authority meant nothing at all. He moved the Amendment in order that the Committee might test the validity of the assertion, that the absolute control of secular education would be left to the education authority.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 8, after the word 'managers' to insert the words 'or managers representing the local education authority.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The speech of the right hon. Gentleman was largely directed towards extracting information from the Government on a point which I honestly thought had been explained, and admirably explained, over and over again. I am not fortunate in my attempts to make the right hon. Gentleman understand the position of the Government, but I will make one more effort, to the very best of my ability, to give a clear and popular account of the position in which I think this manager question stands. Let it be remembered that the Government, in taking up the problem of education, found a system based on the Act of 1870, under which Act there are two kinds of managers. There are the managers of the board schools and the managers of the voluntary schools. These two sets of managers had separate powers and occupied different positions. The managers of the board schools were the creatures of the School Board, could be removed by the School Board, and had to carry out the directions of the School Board. On the other hand, the managers of the voluntary schools had, subject to the Education Department, not only the management but the control of their schools. Well, we had to deal with the two different classes of managers we found in existence. As regards the managers of the School Boards, we have left them practically as we found them, putting in the place of the School Board the education authority; but the managers of the provided schools will bear the same relation to the education authority as the managers under the School Boards now bear to those School Boards. Very well, so much for the managers of the provided schools. Now I come to the other description of managers—the managers of the voluntary schools. Their powers which we found in existence we have not left unchanged by this Bill. On the contrary, we have excised from some of those powers certain very great responsibilities, and we have excised from further powers certain large fragments. We have left to them the appointment of teachers, as the House knows, because we regard that as essential to the denominational character of the school, which we mean to preserve. Hon. Gentlemen opposite do not like that arrangement. They desire not to preserve the denominational character of the school, but I am not going to enter into that at present. We think it ought to be preserved, and we think a convenient way of preserving it is to leave one essential—the appointment of the teachers—to those managers, and to see that among the managers there shall be a majority representative of the denomination. But we have taken away from the managers in the first place the right to be a homogeneous body representing the denomination, because we have provided that two of their number shall not necessarily represent the denomination at all, but shall, on the contrary, represent either the major or the minor local authority. We have, in the second place, taken away from them the control of secular education, and it is on that, apparently, that the right hon. Gentleman's mind is so deeply exercised. If I rightly apprehend him, he feels two great difficulties on that subject. One is the reference to Whitehall, which he appears to think is given under sub-Section 2, and which causes him the greatest anxiety — anxiety so great that I do not think he has addressed us once on any topic in connection with the Bill without referring to it. His other anxiety is lest the control we have avowedly given to the education authority over secular education should, though strongly given in words, be ineffective in fact, and it is in these circumstances that the education authority have to act through a body of managers, of whom a majority would represent the denomination. The difficulty as regards the reference to Whitehall will, I venture to think, be more properly dealt with when we come to sub-Section 2, instead of in this preliminary discussion. Let me repeat now what I stated before, that without going into minutiæ and refinements, the broad principle we desire to see adopted with regard to secular education, is that the education authority shall be the sole controlling power, subject, in the first place, to the minimum requirements laid down by Whitehall, which, I presume, the right hon. Gentleman does not wish to abolish, and which I think no Gentleman on that side of the House who supports him wishes to abolish. In the second place, the appeal to Whitehall is not on the subject of the control of secular education, but on any dispute as to whether a thing is secular education or not.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: That is not in the Clause.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is in. I am, in response to the right hon. Gentleman, giving the view of the Government. I am endeavouring to give a general view of our intentions. We desire within the sphere of secular education that the education authority shall be supreme, but it is evident that, as you preserve the denominational character of the school—and we mean to preserve that, it is part of our policy—there might conceivably be a collision between the managers and the education authority in which the managers would say, "We are quite willing to obey the education authority in regard to matters of secular education, but this is going beyond their province, and they are trespassing into the region of religious education." Hon. Gentlemen may object to that view, but I think that that may happen, and we think that the House cannot leave it there. We think you cannot make the education authority judge in its own case as to the exact limitation of power, and you must, therefore, give it to some third party, and we say that you should give it to the Education Department. Therefore, I hope I have made it clear to the right hon. Gentleman that the reference to the Education Department is not as to the manner in which the education authority is controlling secular education, but only as to whether the controlling authority, as regards secular education, is or is not trespassing beyond its legal function. Then I come to the second difficulty. The second difficulty of the right hon. Gentleman, if I may respectfully say so, is the only one which seems to be distinctly and clearly germane to the Amendment put on the Paper. It is as to whether those managers, being by hypothesis, as regards two thirds of their number, representative, not of the education authority but of the denomination, will prove the proper instrument or machine for carrying out the directions of the education authority as regards secular education. Well, I do not think the danger is a real or practical danger, but if it be, I venture to say that it will be absolutely provided for by the Amendment I have put on the Paper, and to which the right hon. Gentleman has referred. I think that is a much better method of dealing with it than the one he has proposed.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT asked whether the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment was to be a substitute for sub Section 2.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It wants a much more lucid power of expression than I have to make my statements clear to the right hon. Gentleman. I have explained that sub-Section 2 is not intended to interfere with the power of the education authority as regards secular education at all. Therefore, my Amendment on page 40 has nothing whatever to do with sub-Section 2. It is not a substitute for it, but is in addition to it, and it is, in my opinion, a better way of meeting the difficulty than that of the right hon. Gentleman. While I do not describe the precise methods by which the education authority is to carry out its views, the right hon. Gentleman, if I understand him rightly, says that it is to be done by means of two managers who do not necessarily belong to the denomination.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Two managers who are appointed by the education authority.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: They are not appointed necessarily by the education authority.

SIR. WILLIAM HARCOURT: My Amendment is that they are to be "managers representing the education authority."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is not the most convenient way. I daresay it would produce a great deal more friction. I venture to think that my way of dealing with the matter is the better way, but I will defer the discussion of it until I move the Amendment.

MR. BRYCE said that the First Lord had given what he said was a popular sketch of this Clause and of his proposed Amendment. When he listened to the right hon. Gentleman the impression which was on his mind was "What an extraordinary, ridiculous, cumbrous, inconvenient system!" He could not conceive a system which, in working, would be more certain to lead to friction, difficulties and delays. The right hon. Gentleman began by telling the Committee that there were two sets of managers—the managers of the School Boards, and the independent managers of the voluntary schools. As regarded the School Board managers the change which the right hon. Gentleman had made was enormously for the worse, because the School Board system was perfectly convenient in towns where the School Board was at hand, and could keep the managers under its hand, and pull them up if they were doing wrong. That was not a system which could be put in force where the managers were at a great distance, and where the education authority could not keep them under its direction in the same way as in a town. Therefore, as regarded provided schools the change was clearly for the worse. Then, when they came to the non-provided schools, the right hon. Gentleman told the Committee that the arrangement he proposed was adopted in order to secure denominational control, and therefore the managers were to retain the appointment of the teachers. What did that mean? It meant that they were to have a second set of managers who were neither to be independent nor dependent — monstrous creatures combining something of both independence and dependence. They were to split up education and make a difference between religious and secular instruction, and appoint a set of managers with power over the one and not over the other—a set of managers who by the very terms of their appointment must be divided into two hostile factions. They would be a semi-independent body with dependence in name on the local authority at a distance, but they would be practically independent, not only because one part of their functions had been withdrawn from the local authority, but because it would be impossible for the local authority to exercise effective control over them. Now surely the simple course would have been to do one of two things—either to have the managers entirely independent or else a smaller area should have been chosen. Either they could have taken an area in which they would have had an independent body of managers, such as in the existing areas, or else have made the managers absolutely dependent on the central authority for all purposes. There was a large range of questions which lay on the borderland of secular and religious instruction, and the Clause, as proposed to be amended, provided for friction between the two sets of authorities. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to his Amendment, which it would be out of order to discuss at present, but that Amendment did not appear to him to meet the difficulty. The right hon. Gentleman only said that if the managers did not obey the local authority they would be superseded. But what machinery was there in the Bill to do that? The local authority would have to act through these managers—that was, to tell the managers who were already disobedient to obey the orders which they disobeyed, or that the local authority would carry out the orders themselves. Who were "they"? They were managers in office at a distance, it might be, of forty miles from the education authority, which had no direct power to compel them to carry out their orders. He thought, in the whole circumstances, the suggestion of his right hon. friend, that the local authority was to depute managers as their agents to compel the other managers to carry out their orders, was a perfectly practical suggestion. The difficulty was one which the right hon. Gentleman had not faced. It was a difficulty inherent in the nature of the case, and inherent in an attempt to set up an authority which was to be at the same time independent and dependent. The right hon. Gentleman said that they must not make the education authority the judge in their own case. What did that imply? It implied that the managers were not to be under the control of the education authority.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had never denied or concealed that the Government meant the managers to have control over religious education, which was outside the sphere of the education authority. There were two spheres of education—religious and secular.

MR. BRYCE said he denied that these spheres could be separated as the right hon. Gentleman seemed to imagine. The teachers were to give both religious and secular instruction, and it would be perfectly impossible to prevent questions arising constantly in which the two spheres would collide, and in which the managers would defy the local education authority. The control of the education authority would not be an effective control, and that was the reason why, from the first, he had felt that the plan of the right hon. Gentleman could not be a final settlement. It would be impossible for the education authority to give the kind of control which was needed. When the right hon. Gentleman spoke of the religious question as the only question in which difficulty could arise, he forgot all the other items of Clause 8. Controversies would arise about the accounts, with regard to repairs and many other points; and, therefore, by providing, under sub-Section 2, an appeal on all questions—because its terms were perfectly general—they were encouraging the managers to set up their authority against the local education authority. Therefore he could not receive either Clause 8 as it stood, or as amended by the right hon. Gentlemen, as meeting the difficulty. He believed that when they came to sub-Section 2 they should find that the difficulties would be greatest in regard to the financial part of the work, because the managers would have no motive of economy. If all the managers were to be appointed by the education authority, they could choose men who would carry out economic administration; but the majority would be independent, and not liable to be dismissed like School Board managers. Therefore, there was neither one security nor the other. He knew that that was very largely in the minds of the County Councils. He had received many communications pointing out that the greatest difficulty in the Bill would be the impossibility of enforcing economic administration on the managers. It was quite impossible that a proper control over expenditure would be effective. The only way that could be done was to make the managers absolutely dependent on the education authority, and until that was done the system proposed in this Clause would remain a standing difficulty and an obstacle to the proper working of the Bill.

(4.25) Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that he had made an explanation which went beyond the rigid limits of the Amendment, but he hoped that that would not be taken as an excuse for discussing the whole matter.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said he wished to ask the leave of the Committee to make a few remarks on what had fallen from the Leader of the House, in what the right hon. Gentleman called his popular exposition of the working of the Bill. The words of sub-Section 2 raised the question of how the control of education was to be carried out. The right hon. Gentleman was no doubt perfectly clear as regarded what was in his own mind, but he was not clear as to what was in the Bill; and that was one of the great difficulties hon. Members were in, and which led to anticipations of future confusion. The right hon. Gentleman in his popular exposition spoke of the managers as if they were in some degree the present managers, rather than a new body. What were they now? In the ordinary rural parish in a county in the South of England these gentlemen were acting under trust deeds which made them necessarily communicant members of the Church of England. They were four in number including the Chairman, but, under the Bill in the agricultural counties, they would be strengthened to five communicants of the Church of England by the election of one by the County Council. The appointment of the head-master of the school was left in the hands of the managers—which meant really the Chairman. Up to the present time the managers had never been called together, and the Chairman and the head-master conducted the whole business of the school. The managers were only called in to sign the accounts of the school. How then was the county authority to be maintained? The finances of these schools were not of a character for which the county authority would like to be responsible, and they would have to be closely scrutinised? But how was the authority of the education authority to be exercised? In the ordinary rural county when a conflict came it would be between the majority of five managers, who were communicant members of the Church of England, and the representative of the Parish Council. The right hon. Gentleman assumed in his popular exposition that, while he gave the appointment of the teachers to the majority of the managers, in every other matter the education authority would be supreme; but they did not find words to that effect in the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman arbitrarily told the Committee that his opinion was perfectly clear that, for example, the county authority would have the choice of the books to be used in the school, and yet the managers, and not the county authority, were to have the choice of the teachers. But that was not in the Bill itself. The right hon. Gentleman had so clearly expressed his view as to the limitation being expressed in the sub-Section which had been asked for on the previous day, that it was impossible to say which power was a part of secular control and which was not. It was a difficult matter to discuss, and he would not anticipate the discussion. Obviously, the question of finance was the greatest difficulty that would arise.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said a large number of the schools now managed by the School Boards were leased to them for short periods. he moment the School Boards were swept away, those buildings would revert to the educational bodies which built them. His point was that those buildings for some time past had been maintained, and their furniture and fittings would have been provided, by the local authority. Upon the question of the administration of these adjuncts to education, a dispute might arise, which dispute would be settled by the four denominational managers appointed under the Bill. He thought such a dispute ought to be settled not by the representatives of the denominational managers, but by the local authority who had had to provide the school. In the small country School Board area in which he resided there was a great apprehension as to what would occur when these schools, which had been filled up and maintained by the School Board, were handed over to the control of the denominational owners.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That point does not seem to arise here.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE thought it arose on that part of the Amendment that, in the event of any disputes arising they should be settled by the representatives of the local authority. He wished them to have the authority.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That point is not covered by this Amendment; it will require an Amendment dealing with that class of schools.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) said that nothing could be clearer than the statement of the Prime Minister as to the intention of the Government, but he desired to emphasise what had been said by his right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean, that the intention of the Government was not put into the Bill. Everybody knew that when the Bill became an Act it would be construed from what appeared on the face of the Act itself, and no one was allowed to go behind it and look into the statements of the right hon. Gentleman to see what was intended. There were two ways in which the matter might be dealt with. The first was by limiting the power and authority to be given to the education authority and giving greater powers to the managers; the second, and he submitted the better way, would be to give uncontrolled power to the education authority, and carve out of that the powers to be given to the managers. The powers of control over the denominational schools were in the hands of trustees, and the intention was that the trustees should no longer bind the new statutory body if it was a new statutory body subordinate to the education authority. If that was so it ought to be made plain in the Act what the powers of the new statutory body were to be. That was done in the Act of 1870, and it should be borne in mind that in Clause 7, as altered, there was no reference to the Act of 1870, although there was a reference to it in the clause as originally drawn. He did not know whether this new statutory body, the new managers of the "not provided" schools, were to have any of the powers which managers had under the Act of 1870. In that Act there were powers given to the managers of the denominational schools to require a public inquiry when the Education Department said there was not accommodation enough for the education of the children. Did that power vest in this new statutory body? He did not know, but if it did it ought to appear in the Bill.

They also had powers in certain cases to acquire land under the provisions of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act. Were all these powers to be vested in this new statutory body? He did not know. It had been stated that they did, but the Bill did not say so. It would be quite as open to the Prime Minister to say they had to fix the salaries of the teachers. Nothing was said about that, but it was well known that the intention of the Government was that the local authority should fix the salaries of the teachers, and therefore that would not come within the power of this new statutory body. Nothing had been said about the appointment of the teachers. If they were to have the control of the appointment of the teachers, it would appear to follow that they should also control the salary of the teachers; but the fact of the Prime Minister having stated the intention of the Government showed that the powers of this new statutory body were absolutely undefined. The Government having created this body had not defined its powers. According to the provisions of the Bill it was open to anybody to argue that they had or had not the appointment of the teachers or the fixing of their salaries, and it was therefore necessary that these powers should be defined.

Mr. HUMPHREYS-OWEN maintained that there ought to be a clear understanding of the principle on which they were going to proceed. He thought there ought to be a complete transfer of all the schools to the new authority. At present the Bill left the matter absolutely vague. The draftsmen of the Bill ought to let the Committee know clearly what the authority was. If these schools and managers were to occupy their present position, except so far as the position was modified by the modifications of the Statute, it would be necessary to discuss at length every point with regard to the rights of managers. If on the other hand it was proposed to transfer these properties to the local education authority, then the attention of the Committee could be devoted to the Clause which it would be necessary to insert in the Bill to preserve the right of a denomination to deal with the school simply for the purpose of giving denominational teaching.

Mr. LLYOD-GEORGE said the Committee could not discuss in detail the matters which the Prime Minister had touched upon, but there were one or two particular questions upon which they were entitled to get an answer. The Committee were on the threshold of the position of the managers in their relation to the education authority, and they ought to know what were the views of the Government. From the statement of the Prime Minister they presumably did know, but the right hon. Gentleman's statements were not upheld by the Bill as drafted. He was sorry to think that the Prime Minister had gone back upon a statement he made yesterday, and rather suggested now that there should be an appeal not only on the question of *ultra vires* but also upon such matters as repairs and structural alterations. That showed that the Prime Minister had not clearly thought out in his own mind what the relations were to be between the managers and the local education authority. As far as secular instruction was concerned, would the control of the local education authority over the managers be as complete as the control of the same authority over the managers of board schools?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: If I understand the question, the hon. Member asks me whether the education authority will have the same complete control over secular education in the non-provided as in the provided schools. I answer in the affirmative. If he asks me whether the control is the same in both cases, it clearly is not, because they cannot dismiss the foundation managers.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that that was a point they could not now discuss. He wanted to know whether the managers were merely the agents of the education authority in the case of secular education. Supposing the education authority were not satisfied with the staff of the denominational managers, could they order them to recast the staff?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: And if they refuse, the new Amendment of the Prime Minister will come into operation, and the managers can be suppressed.

MR A. J. BALFOUR: So far as I understand the question, the education authority can say "We think your teachers are inefficient."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Or unfit.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes. "You must dismiss them, or some of them, because they cannot carry on the secular work of the school," and they can call upon them to reorganise their staff. If they refuse, then the education authority can do as it pleases without them.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE submitted that that could not be done, except by some such means as the Amendment before the House proposed. Then there was the case of promotion. If a teacher did his work extremely well, could the education authority order his promotion? That was a very important question. The Prime Minister had said the education authority was given complete control over secular, and the managers over religious, education, but who was to have control over subjects lying between the secular and religious spheres, as, for example, what had been called civics, or the teaching of the duties of citizenship? The Prime Minister must surely begin to realise that the whole scheme of the Bill as it stood now must break down in practice. It was a dual system, it would lead to friction and quarrels, and the whole thing would end in confusion.

(4.55.) SIR ROBERT FINLAY expressed the opinion that in practice the scheme would work with great smoothness. All the difficulties started by learned Gentlemen opposite did credit to their ingenuity, but they were not difficulties that would be experienced in practice. He thought that the Opposition had no reason to complain of any want of definiteness on the part of the Government in answering the point which had been raised. The hon. Member for Mid Glamorgan said it was extraordinary that there was nothing in the Bill to show that the managers might not fix the teachers' salaries. It was clear that the hon. Member had not read the words which had been inserted at the opening of the Clause, stating that the local education authority should have control of all expenditure required for the maintenance and efficiency of all public elementary schools "other than expenditure for which, under this Act, provision is to be made by the managers." If those words did not give the fixing of the teachers' salaries to the education authority, he really did not know what words would. Hon. Members opposite had presented a succession of difficulties in the way of understanding the Bill. He had the greatest respect for the powers of mind and intellect possessed by those hon. Members, but if those powers were devoted to not understanding the Bill, he defied any draftsman to make the measure clear. The Amendment proposed that in the event of the managers not carrying out the directions of the local authority the manager or managers representing the authority should carry them out. But suppose the representative of the minor authority was in entire sympathy with the foundation managers: surely it would be most unreasonable to say that the local education authority, if the managers as a whole were recalcitrant, were to be compelled to put the carrying out of their directions into the hands of two men, one of whom might have declared himself to be in entire sympathy with the foundation managers.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The Attorney General does not understand what I meant by the Amendment. I did not mean to include anybody who was not a representative of the Board of Education. I put in the words "manager or managers" because it is not yet determined how many representatives of the education authority there should be. My Amendment proposes that the carrying out of the directions of the authority should be in the hands of a manager or managers representing the education authority.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY accepted the right hon. Gentleman's statement, and was sorry if he had misunderstood him. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to make it compulsory on the education authority to carry out their desires through their own representative—if there was only one—on the board of managers. Surely it would be inexpedient to make that compulsory. That representative might not be the fittest person for the purpose, and he certainly failed to see the sense of so tying the hands of the authority. They were to have the right of carrying out their directions through anyone they chose to appoint as their agent. Why in the name of common sense should they be restricted to choosing this one man? The proposal was not a good one, and he hoped the Committee would not accept it.

MR. M'KENNA said the First Lord of the Treasury had now made a statement as accurate as his speech at Manchester was misleading. The right hon. Gentleman now laid the power of the voluntary managers on the trustees; they were to have the same powers as the old managers, subject to such deductions as were made under the Bill. A day or two previously the First Lord had declared a certain amount to be unnecessary because the local authority had control over the expenditure as the Clause then stood, but the Attorney General had now stated that what gave that control were words which had since been added.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I never said anything in the slightest degree resembling that. What I said was that these words made it perfectly clear beyond the risk of any possible misapprehension.

MR. M'KENNA said they now came to the excised part of the powers of the managers. They were now to obey the directions of the local education authority. He submitted that those directions would represent no greater power than the Board of Education at present possessed. The Board could already insist upon the qualification of teachers, require particular subjects to be taught, demand a certain standard of efficiency, and insist on the suitability of the buildings and the sufficiency of the accommodation. Those were the subjects, and those only, which would come under the definition of "matters relating to secular education." The great matter relating to secular instruction, viz., the appointment of the teacher to give that instruction, was admittedly to remain in the hands of the voluntary managers. Did the sub-Clause mean that the local authority could regulate the duties of the teachers? Was it proposed to give the voluntary managers a right of appeal to the Board of Education on the question of financial control?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I rise to order. I have done my best to make the position of the Government clear, and, perhaps, in doing so travelled somewhat beyond the Amendment. Is it in order for the hon. Gentleman to go on discussing questions which have nothing whatever to do with the Amendment?

MR. M'KENNA said he was only endeavouring to get at the facts, but if the right hon. Gentleman did not wish to answer the question, he would not press it. The position would be that the education authority would have only such powers over education as now belonged to the Board of Education. They would have no control as to the appointment or the duties of the teachers; they would have no real control over the school at all.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As I understand the matter, the Amendment is one, not to say in what respect the control of the education authority should exist, but to improve the machinery by which it should be exercised. The hon. Member is discussing the area of the control, not the machinery.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: My Amendment is not a question of machinery exclusively.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Entirely.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Not so. It is a complaint that under the present system the control itself is too limited.

MR. M'KENNA frankly admitted that the speech he wished to make went beyond the strict terms of the Amendment, but he was only following the lines taken by previous speakers.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The discussion has taken a somewhat wide range, but I thought it had narrowed down again, and I was hoping it would remain within the narrower limits. It is desirable that it should do so.

MR. M'KENNA said he would confine himself to the single point that the local authority, in case the managers disagreed, were to operate through the single managers appointed by them. The authority, having the power of the purse, could stop the salary of any teacher, but the managers could refuse to obey the local authority, and retain the teacher in their employ, although he would not be able to recover his salary. The Amendment proposed that in such a case the power of the existing foundation managers should be ousted, and the manager appointed by the authority have sole control. That was essential. It was perfectly clear that, if the scheme was to be carried on at all, power must be given to somebody—whether this particular manager or someone else—under the control of the education authority to dismiss the teacher and pay his salary to some suitable person. He should therefore support the Amendment.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said he wished to say a word on the merits of the Amendment itself. He thought the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman opposite would be calculated to defeat the original purpose of the Bill. He did not think the Bill would work if this Amendment were accepted, for the object of the Government was to bring the control of education under the local authority; they had already provided for the managers of the schools; there was to be the Education Committee, of which they knew nothing; the Education Department were to have certain directing powers; and now this Amendment introduced a fifth authority. He saw no reason for setting up a representative of the local authority, which would impair the original purpose of the Bill, namely, the handing over of education to a single authority. He agreed that they should entrust the local authority with all the powers they could. As to the passing of the Bill, he had rarely seen such slow progress made with a measure, and it did not look as though the Bill was meant to pass. He would certainly commend to His Majesty's Government the advisability of being conciliatory and make all the concessions they could which would not affect the principle of the Bill. Although he wished to be conciliatory, he should be unable to support the present Amendment.

(5.18.) Question put—

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 140; Noes, 256. (Division List No. 404.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hon Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C.E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt Hon. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell

Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, SirR.Thresbie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas,J.A(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton,John Lawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York,W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams,Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson,Fred. W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson,Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJ T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt. Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T.Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown,Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A(Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson,Rt.Hon.Sir Edward H.
Carvill,Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,RtHonJA(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb,SirJohnCharlesReady
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox,Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross,Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland.SirFredDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hon,SirWilliamHart
Elliot,Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes,Hon.Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,SirRobertPenrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS)Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson,SirAugustusFred'rick
Gore,Hn.G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene,W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Rt.HnLord G(Mid'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse,Henry (Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys,Rt.Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt. Hn.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon. Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton,Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareh'm
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macartney,RtHnW.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool
M'Arthur Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas

More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon M. W (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C E H. (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt Hon Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby, de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(5.32.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question, 'That the words of the Clause to the word "school," in line 10, inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question, 'That the words of the Clause to the word "school," in line 10, inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 254; Noes, 143. (Divison List, No. 405.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey. James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Brassey, Albert
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson

Garfit, William
Godson, Sir AugustusFrederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(Bu'ySEdm'nds
Greene,Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene,W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Greville, Hon. Roland
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashfo'd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Heath,James(Staffords.N.W.)
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier,Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, John
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. FrederickWm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants,Fareh'm
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macartney,Rt.HnW.G.Ellison
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop,James (Stirlingshire)
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel,Hn. Wm. Robt.Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,Hon M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde(BethnalGreen
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild,Hon.Lionel Walter

Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj.J.E.B. (I.of Wight)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M.H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col Sir C E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby,Lt-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt.Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan,Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles

Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt,Rt.Hon.Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester

Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon, Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. Jno. (Montrose)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Wm. M'Arthur.

(5.48.) Question put accordingly, "That the words of the Clause to the word 'school,' in line 10, inclusive, stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 267; Noes, 135. (Division List, No. 406.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Ashton Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. (Wingfield-
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dix'n
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Emmott, Alfred
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W

Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHnL'rd G(Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H(Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Maxwell, RtHnSir H E(Wigt'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
More, Robt. Jasper(Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, RtHnA. Graham(Bute
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, HnWm Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. HonChas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B(Isle of Wight)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, H C(North'mb Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Edwd. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H(Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Asquith, Rt Hon Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest, J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. M'Kenna and Mr. Charles Hobhouse.

(6.0.) Mr. M'KENNA said his task in moving the Amendment he now proposed to move had been rendered easier by the statement of the First Lord of the Treasury. They now knew what the functions of the managers, under the Bill as it stood, were to be. They were to have all the powers of the old voluntary school managers except those destroyed by Clause 8. It had been urged that the only way to preserve the denominational character of these schools was to give them the management of all matters save secular instruction. The First Lord had reminded the Committee that all instruction was either religious or secular, but as a matter of fact there was a large body of instruction which could not be described as either one or the other, and it was with the powers in connection with that instruction that his Amendment proposed to deal. The Amendment would give to the local education authority full power over the management of the schools in everything outside denominational instruction; it would give, for instance, to the authority which found the money the control of the articles purchased with its own money. The Amendment was one that could hardly be resisted. It did not touch the question of the appointment of the teachers, which was a matter appertaining alike to religious and secular instruction. He merely asked, in order to make the position of the local authority clear, that in matters relating to the management of the schools, other than religious instruction, the local education authority should be supreme. In view of the frequent declarations made by the First Lord of the Treasury that he desired to give full control to the education authority over secular education he could not see what grounds could be found for resisting the Amendment.

Amendment proposed.

"In page 3, line 10, after the word 'school' to insert the words 'and as to all matters relating to the management of the school other than the religious instruction given therein.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. Gentleman wanted to reverse the procedure adopted in the Bill, which was to work on the plan provided by the Act of 1870 and to excise from the existing powers of the managers those which might interfere with the proper control of secular education by the education authority. He thought the plan provided in the Bill was a better plan than that provided in the Amendment.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT asked where in the Bill the existing powers of the managers under the Act of 1870 were preserved? There were no words giving these new bodies the powers possessed by the old managers. Orginally there was a reference in Clause 7, but that had been cut out of the Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said they had to deal with the question of managers on a later Clause; it was not relevant to this Amendment. If the right hon. Gentleman would look at the new Clause which he had put down on the Paper, he would see that the point was touched on there.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) thought the right hon. Gentleman was proceeding in an extraordinary way. The proper course surely would have been to excise the smaller powers from the greater and not the greater from the smaller. The sphere of the denominational managers was much smaller than that of the educational authority. There were a great many questions as to which the Committee were entirely in the dark as to whether they came under secular or religious instruction, and those matters should undoubtedly and without qualification be controlled by the local education authority. With regard to furniture that had to be provided for religious as well as secular purposes, which head did that come under? The provision of school books admittedly came within the sphere of secular instruction, but there was nothing in the Bill to show it. Did the granting of prizes and certificates come within the sphere of secular instruction? In his opinion all these matters should be controlled by the secular authority. Would the granting of holidays on saints' days come under religious or secular instruction? That, he imagined, would appertain to both; but surely the right to grant holidays ought to be in the hands of the local authority; yet there was nothing in the Bill with regard to matters of that kind. Unless the Amendment was adopted there would be innumerable cases of friction between the two bodies. The promotion of teachers was certainly a matter within the sphere of the secular control, and also the imposition and remission of fees, as it was possible to discriminate in matters of this kind distinctly to the advantage of those attending a particular school. These questions ought to be cleared up. The Committee ought not to discuss this matter with their hands tied, as they were at the present time. The question of the exclusion of scholars from the schools should also be left to the local education authority. He appealed to the Prime Minister to free the country and the local education authorities from the difficulties in which they would be placed for many years to come if these matters were not dealt with, and trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would not leave the ultimate decision to the Board of Education, which, with great respect, was under a political head and subject to partizan control.

MR. BRYCE did not think this Amendment ought to be regarded in a controversial spirit. The first part of the Amendment was to secure that the division between secular and religious instruction should be an exhaustive one. The proper way for the Government to provide for it would be to declare that everything except religious instruction should be under the local education authority. Some Amendment of that kind would crystallise the position. Another point as to which it was desirable to have a clear understanding was, who should have control of the timetable. That was a matter of great importance to the schools, because on it depended the times for religious and secular instruction. He supposed the local education authority would have complete control.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W. R., Morley) thought there was real substance in the Amendment. At present the managers of the denominational schools had both the management and the control, but when the control was to be given to one body and the management to another it was important that a distinction should be made between the duties which were to be given to each body. The present managers were responsible to the Education Department alone and all the powers which were not taken out of their hands by this Clause would, by presumption, be left in the hands of the managers. It was most important to make clear all the matters for which the managers were responsible. What he asked was that where this Clause did not make over any specific duties the residuary duties should lie in the hands of the managers through the local authorities.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) urged that some general words should be added which, whilst not touching religious instruction, would in a general way cover the whole of school management. Otherwise there would be much friction between managers and local authorities. He had had ten years experience on the London School Board, and he had brought with him the code of management which the London School Board had found it necessary to compile, which he would hand to the Prime Minister, who, he thought, would find it instructive.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR did not believe that in practice much difficulty would arise from the division proposed. He thought the best course would be to adhere to the Bill.

MR. MOSS (Denbighshire, E.) thought that most of the discussion might have been avoided if the duties of the two powers had been defined exactly. If the powers to be exercised were left vague there would be discussions throughout the Bill as to what the duties of the bodies concerned should be. If the right hon. Gentleman would follow the Amendment he would see that everything except religious instruction was left to the local educational authority, which was exactly what he himself wished apparently. If that was so the right hon. Gentleman could not have any objection to his own intentions being expressed in the Bill.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said that to those who had had something to do with the management of schools the points raised by his hon. friend were of eminently practical importance. Outside the ordinary school work, nothing was of more importance than the encouragement of the children by the giving of prizes. He instanced a case in which out of 159 prizes given in a particular school only nine were for secular subjects, the other 150 being awarded for religious knowledge. Surely hon. Gentlemen who had sons at public or other schools would not be satisfied if the only prizes they won were Scripture prizes. Why should a system be allowed to continue which permitted managers to offer rewards in such a lop-sided way? All sides of education, not merely the religious, ought to be considered, and the local authority ought to have power to adopt a different practice if they found managers acting in the manner he had instanced. Reference had been made to the selection of text-books, but what about the pictures on the walls of the school? Pictures now played a very important part in education. The education authority would pay for those pictures: who would choose them? Many of those in voluntary schools were extremely obnoxious to the parents of Nonconformist children. Were the public to have no control in such a matter? Satisfactorily to work this Clause would be impossible unless some definite system were laid down as to who was to control matters of this kind.

MR. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.) said he knew of a country School Board which was trying to empty a voluntary school by giving, at the expense of the ratepayers, an excessive number of prizes.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is not relevant to the Amendment.

MR. RICHARDS, referring to the pictures, asked whether the hon. Member suggested there were any pictures in voluntary schools which were not accurate representations of history.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think that that question either is relevant.

MR. RICHARDS asked then whether the Board of Education would make a list of pictures which might not appear because they were obnoxious to Nonconformist parents.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said the meaning of the Amendment was perfectly clear. The managers would be managers with regard to both secular and religious education. The whole of the management would be in their hands. All the Amendment asked was that the managers should obey the directions of the education authority, except in matters relating to religious education. Put in that way, he thought there was no answer to the case of his hon. friend.

MR. M'KENNA said that in consequence of the perfunctory answer he had received, he felt bound to go to a division. The local education authority paid the bill, and therefore ought to have the control of the school.

(6.38.) Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 141; Noes, 265. (Division List, No. 407.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander, William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffiths, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke,
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. M'Kenna and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r

Mr. Samuel Evans.

Balfour,RtHnGeraldW (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles,Capt. H.F.(Middlesex)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. Sir John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown,Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell,RtHnJ.A.(Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill,Patrick Geo.Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.(Birm.)
Chamberlain,RtHnJA.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb,SirJohnCharlesReady
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox,Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,SirHoratioD(Chatham
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland,SirFr'dDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon.SirJohnE.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B.(Hants,W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes,Hon.AilwynEdward
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,SirRobertPenrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
GordonMajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore,HnGR.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst,Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(B'ryS.Edm'nds
Greene, HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W.Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Roland
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Heath,James(Staffords. N.W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse,Henry (Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,J.(Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys,Rt.Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon,Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop
Kimber, Henry
Lambton,Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(BristolS)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macartney,RtHnW.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Killop,James (Stirlingshire)
Maxwell,RtHnSirHE.(Wigt'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Peel,Hn.WmRobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington,Lieut-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins. Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley,S Forde(BethnalGreen
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H.(Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,James Parker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,Hn.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M‘Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Vicount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H.(Shef'ld
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby,Lt.-Col.ACE.(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H(Ashton-und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm.H.(Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt.Hon.C.B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood, and Mr. Anstruther.

(6.55.) MR. WHITLEY said the Amendment standing in his name would not have been necessary if the Government had accepted the Amendment which had just been voted upon. The Government having declined to allow the education authority to lay down rules to guide the managers, it had become necessary to raise this point. At the present time the methods of voluntary school managers were exceedingly lax. He did not think he would be stepping beyond the mark if he said that in three-fourths of the voluntary schools there was no regular meeting of the managers, and one-half of them did not attend. The one act which these managers had to do as a rule was simply to sign Form 9 when taken round to them either by the vicar or the head teacher. If the managers were going to have these important duties without the local authority having power to lay down what methods they should follow, then the Committee should introduce some words which would give regularity to the meetings and methods of the managers. He asked that the managers should be obliged to hold at least one meeting per month, with the exception of the month of August, and that they should keep proper minutes of their proceedings. It was extremely desirable when any decision was arrived at that there should be a record as to who was present at that meeting. Unless some such Amendment was accepted it would be quite possible for managers to go on in the old lax way with only one manager present at a meeting, and there was no security that the decisions would be arrived at by the full meeting of managers. He had an Amendment on the Paper providing for a quorum of three. On this point he thought the proper thing for the Committee to do was to lay down a certain time once a month for meetings, and it was not too much to ask the managers to meet once a month for eleven months in the year, and they should appoint a secretary to keep a record of their proceedings which, he presumed, would be open to the inspection of the local authority. This was so reasonable an Amendment that it did not require any further argument, and he begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, at end, to insert the words 'shall hold at least one meeting in each month excepting August, and shall keep proper minutes of their proceedings.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the objection raised by the hon. Member was that under the present system the managers, or a majority of them, absented themselves from their duty and left matters very much to the clergyman of the parish. That could not happen after this Bill was passed. If it were true that denominational managers did treat their duties in the lax manner suggested, he did not believe there was any danger that the duties to be discharged by the managers would be left to one of their number, because he would find himself conjoined with two other managers. The result would be that the school would not be managed by one single individual, because he would find himself conjoined by two other members. He thought it was not necessary to add such a minute provision to the Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked whether there was any provision in the Bill at all to compel the managers to meet. If they did not meet there could not possibly be a majority. His hon. friend said that they should meet, and if the denominational managers did not attend the other members would be able to congratulate themselves on having a majority. There were at present five or six managers in every parish, but, as a matter of fact, they did not meet, and there was nothing in the Bill to prevent that system continuing. The clergyman took upon himself the whole functions of the managers, and he was the correspondent of the Education Department. There was nothing in the Bill to prevent him doing exactly as he had done in the past. What was wanted in the Bill was a provision to compel the summoning of a meeting. The right hon. Gentleman was proceeding on the assumption that his Bill was all right. He intended fairly, but he was dealing with a number of men he knew nothing about, and once there was the slightest difficulty they would act up to the letter of the law. There was not a single syllable in the Bill to compel the clergyman to summon a meeting of the managers from one year's end to the other. The right hon. Gentleman had said that practically the Amendment was embodied in the Bill.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I never said the Bill did anything so absurd as to prescribe the number of meetings.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that really showed how much the right hon. Gentleman knew about local government. He talked of the absurdity of prescribing the number of meetings the local authority should have. Did not the right hon. Gentleman know that the Local Government Acts prescribed when meetings were to be held, and even the times of meetings had been laid down by Statute. It was something like trifling with the House to suggest that a proposal of this sort should not be incorporated in the Bill.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said the Local Government Act of 1888, introduced by a colleague of the Prime Minister, prescribed when meetings of County Councils were to be held, and similar provision was made in the Act of 1892, introduced by a Liberal Government, in regard to parish councils. The last-mentioned Act provided that no parish council meeting should be held before six o'clock in the evening. In view of these facts, what was there absurd in the request of his hon. friend the Member for Halifax? He thought the committee through which the local authority was to act should also be compelled to meet. There was nothing in the Bill compelling the committee to meet.

Mr. BRYCE hoped the First Lord of the Treasury would give serious attention to the proposal. With many denominational schools there was no system of regular meetings of managers, but simply a meeting to pass accounts, and a resolution delegating to the Chairman all the functions of the managerial body for the rest of the year. They should not allow that state of things to arise in future. He suggested that there were three ways of dealing with this matter. The right hon. Gentleman could accept the Amendment, but if he liked he could make the meetings quarterly instead of monthly; the second way was to give power to the local education authority to make bye-laws fixing the time when the managers should meet; or, thirdly, a schedule could be put in the Bill, containing a sort of code for the direction of managers in this and other matters.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR did not wish to treat this in a perfunctory manner. He could not understand how, with a body of representative managers, the work could be carried on without meetings.

Mr. BRYCE said it was no unusual practice for no meetings to be summoned except for passing the annual accounts.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR admitted that there were Members in the House more practically acquainted with these affairs than himself. His work had lain in other directions, but he should have thought that when Parliament entrusted a body of managers with certain work it would not be competent for that body to delegate its functions to one member. It seemed to him clear that a clergyman could not act without the representative managers. He really could not see that there was any practical danger at all. Were they seriously to suppose that the education authority were going to hand over all their money to be illegally distributed by a single individual without the consent of the whole body of managers? He believed the Amendment useless, as he ventured to think he had shown, but he would be willing to consider, at a later stage of the Bill, whether it might not be possible to provide that, where an education authority thought it necessary to require a meeting, that meeting should be called.

Sir EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) said he thought the right hon. the First Lord of the Treasury had considerably under-rated the evils that were going on at the present time. He knew of a case where no meeting was ever summoned, and all that needed to be done was to get the accounts signed by two individuals. Such a practice could be carried on still, unless the local authority was empowered to withhold grants from the schools. He understood the First Lord to say that that danger would be averted by the fact that one of the representative managers would write up to the education authority that he was not being consulted in the management of the schools, and that then the education authority would withhold the grants, and so bring the managers to reason. That was a most important statement, although it was not in the Bill just now. The First Lord had argued that this was too minute a point for much controversy. He was disposed to agree with that, but he again pressed on the right hon. Gentleman the suggestion urged by the hon. Member for North Camberwell that some general power should be given to secure that all these minute points should be met either by the managers or the local education authority. There would be a number of questions which would come up in the debatable land, which did not come, as this did not come, directly under the head either of religious or of secular instruction. To whom did this debatable land belong? Who was to be the residuary legatee of powers that did not come under any special definition in the Bill? Were they to make the education authority or the managers residuary legatee? Of course those who agreed with him would like it to be the local education authority.

Mr. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) said he was glad to hear his right hon. friend promise to give further consideration to this point. It was a very real one. He quite agreed that the conditions in the future would differ very materially from those in the past; but they must recollect that large numbers of conditions were laid down in existing trust deeds. Many trust deeds made full provision for calling meetings, the person who was to call them, and the way in which they were to be conducted. Now, they were not rescinding these arrangements by this Clause. There was nothing, so far as he had noticed, in the Bill itself, or in the proposed Amendment, which would set at naught such provisions. It had been suggested that if the two appointed representatives were not called to a meeting they should take steps to call one themselves. He should have thought himself that the Clause which gave the local authority control over secondary education included the power to call meetings of the managers; but if there was any doubt about it, it should be made clear. He hoped the managers would not have much control, but they would have a guiding influence over the schools; and, if Churchmen and Nonconformists were to work together, it should be under well-considered regulations, so that there should be no feeling of unfair dealing on the one side or the other. Let the appointed managers realise that whatever was done by the majority was done in accordance with rules fixed by the House of Commons. He knew full well many a school that had gone to utter ruin through the failure of the managers to meet, and there was a possibility of a school drifting into evil ways unless provision was made for regular meetings. He trusted that every local education authority would be charged with the duty of laying down regulations which should prevail throughout the whole of their area for the proper conduct of every school under their control.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that this matter had been a subject of judicial decision. It had been laid down by the courts of law that unless the visiting committee of a board of guardians, which had very important duties to discharge, was properly summoned by the Chairman, that committee had no power to act. The right hon. Gentleman was not justified in assuming that this matter was too minute for the House of Commons to deal with. It was thoroughly discussed in 1870, and in the Education Act of that year it was laid down in the Schedule in the strongest manner, that the smallest School Boards in the country were bound by these Schedules. Not only that, but the provisions were found inadequate, and they were further laid down with the utmost minuteness in the Act of 1873. If Parliament now deliberately neglected to lay down similar provisions with regard to the other schools, it would undoubtedly be held that this was a purposed neglect, and that they were not subject to rules for the proper convening and holding of meetings.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean had undoubtedly a very wide knowledge of these matters. He would carefully consider whether, as regarded meetings of managers where secular education was concerned, anything should be done by way of a Schedule to the Bill.

MR. WHITLEY said he wanted to ask the First Lord what objection there was to the Amendment being inserted at this point. In all the words the right hon. Gentleman had addressed to the Committee he gave no hint as to why this modest request should not be granted, or as to why the managers should not be compelled to keep minutes of their proceedings.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he wished to point out to the hon. Member that if his Amendment was dealt with now the matter could not be dealt with when the Committee came to the Schedule.

MR. WHITLEY said he was willing to withdraw his Amendment on the assurance of the First Lord; but he asked that the words to be inserted in the Schedule should be put down on the Paper at an early day. If that were done it would prevent many Amendments on the Paper being moved.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he could not give the exact day when he would place the Amendment on the Paper, but he would do it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Committee report Progress, to sit again Tomorrow.

EVENING SITTING.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

(9.0.) THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (MR. WYNDHAM, Dover), in moving the second reading of this Bill, said it proposed to give legislative sanction to an agreement between the Royal Dublin Society and the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction. At present, under the Probate Duties (Scotland and Ireland) Act, 1888, a sum of £5,000 was administered by the Royal Dublin Society for the improvement of horse-breeding in Ireland. The society was prepared, willing, and, he believed, eager to transfer the administration of this annual grant to the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, and the Department was equally anxious to administer the fund. He hoped and believed the House would come to the conclusion that the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction was the proper body to administer this fund.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

*MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) said that if the right hon. Gentleman could assure the House that the Bill had the sanction and approval of the Royal Dublin Society, it was not a measure that ought to be contested. If there was one body which had been more successful in administering the affairs of Ireland than any other, it was the Royal Dublin Society, which had now been in existence for 142 years or thereabouts.

A great part of its money had been usefully applied to promoting the breed of horses and cattle, and the Society had instituted a horse show which had obtained European celebrity. All he asked then was the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman that this transfer had the full sanction and co-operation of the Council of that society.

MR. FLYNN (Cork Co., N.) said he did not often find himself in disagreement with the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken, but he could not quite follow his argument, and he certainly thought the Department of Agriculture was the best fitted to administer the money. At the same time, no Irishman desired to detract from the merits of the great horse show at Ballibridge, which had obtained world-wide celebrity. There was no desire on the part of the Irish Members to oppose a Bill of this kind; on the contrary, they would be glad to see it pass; but he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would press upon the Department the fact that it was not necessary to the carrying out of their work in the development of horses and cattle, that every official who was appointed should be either an Englishman or a Scotchman. At present the policy of the Department in this respect seemed to be "that no Irishman need apply" for no matter how eminent or capable an Irishman might be, however well fitted he might be for a post under the Department. the fact that he was an Irishman seemed to be a disqualification in the eyes of the Department. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would impress on the Department that in future such a policy must not be pursued.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.) regarded the Bill as a step in the right direction. At the same time he hoped that this Department would not become a second Local Government Board, and that the Committees which were now working all over Ireland in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture would not be treated in the way the Local Government Board treated local bodies. He had for years been a member of a council which had adopted the technical scheme, and which had taxed the people for the purpose of backing up the Department in giving agricultural and technical instruction with a view to improving the condition of the people in the West of Ireland, and he trusted that in the future the recommendations of the County Council would receive more attention at the hands of the Department.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.) complained that the Department sent ignorant and incompetent Englishmen and Scotchmen to lecture the Irish farmers on agricultural matters, and he had only that day read in a local newspaper the fact that a County Council had felt it to be its duty to condemn the action of one of these Scottish experts. The Irish people did not want to be Anglicised, and many Councils were becoming disgusted with the class of teachers selected by the Board. The Department too was looked upon with a certain amount of suspicion by a great number of people who were beginning to think that this endeavour to develop the industries of the country, to improve the breeds of stock and to grow better crops was really intended to create a fictitious value for the land in the interests of the landlords. He hoped at any time there would be a great improvement effected in the methods of the Department.

*MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.) said they were all agreed as to the desirability of the transfer, but they desired an opportunity of discussing the work of the Department. It was very important that the Department should be national in fact as well as in name, and that it should be in harmony with the general feeling of the country. Moreover, there was undoubtedly a necessity for more elasticity in its working; at present it was too much bound up in red tape, and the result was that it strangled new industries. Only that day he had had brought under his notice a case in which a lady had started a blackberry jam industry, which had found employment for a considerable number of children and others. She obtained a grant of £10 from the Agricultural Committee of the County Council, and set to work. But the Department subsequently declined to sanction the grant, on the ground that the Technical and not the Agricultural Committee should have sanctioned the proceeding. It was doubtful if there would be any more blackberry jam made in that district in future.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.) said there was a very strong feeling throughout the country as to the manner in which the Department filled vacant appointments, and he hoped that it would cease to make "no Irish need apply" its motto in the appointment of officials.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for tomorrow.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Jeffreys (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON had on the Paper an Amendment to provide for two Schedules; one containing a List of Acts to be "continued until repealed," and the other containing a List of Acts to be continued, in whole, or in part, till the 31st December, 1903. The hon. Member said he understood that his Amendment was ruled to be out of order.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think it is out of order, because it proposes to make various expiring laws into permanent Acts of Parliament, and that is not within the scope of the present Bill.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I take it that your objection is to the form of words I employ. The object of this Bill is the continuance of certain Acts of Parliament: surely it is for the House to say for how long they shall be continued. The Bill proposes to continue certain Acts until 1903; is it not competent for me to move to substitute 1953? What I propose to do is to divide the Acts into two schedules.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) said he had intended to propose a similar Amendment, although in a somewhat different form, and although he had great respect for the ruling of the Chair, he must confess he did not see the validity of the ruling in this particular instance. Why could they not have in the schedule a column stating for how long each Act should continue? He failed to see why such an Act as the Ballot Act, which had the approval of the entire House, should not be rendered permanent. He should have thought that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Dundee was in order, but if not, he wished to know if his suggestion to carry out a similar object would be in order.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said that, with all due respect, he would strongly urge the view that if the proposal of his hon. friend were accepted it would mean that, in an obscure way and by a side wind, the Committee would be making perpetual Acts, which, up to the present, had been renewable from year to year.

*The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As regards the point of order raised by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dundee, I am quite clear on the subject. Every Act continues in force until it is repealed, and the proposal of the hon. and learned Gentleman to continue certain expiring laws for fixed periods, or till repealed by Parliament, would be out of order. I do not give that opinion as from myself only. I have consulted the authorities of the House, and I am fortified by their opinion also.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

(9.35.) Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he ventured to repeat the hope he expressed last night that this was the last occasion on which the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill would be presented in its existing form. After the admissions which had been made by the First Lord of the Treasury, the inclusion of the Ballot Act and the Employers Liability Act in the Bill could not be defended for a moment. It was the universal view of the House that that was a scandal. The Prime Minister himself admitted the force of their contention, which was that when the Bill had to be brought in again, permanent Acts should be made permanent, and temporary Acts should be continued as at present. He ventured to appeal to the Attorney General for an assurance that a different policy would be pursued in the future.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said he quite agreed with his hon. and learned friend that it was absurd that an Act like the Ballot Act, which had been accepted by all parties as one of the irrevocable laws of the country, should have to be renewed from year to year; but he strongly protested against the doctrine that legislation which Parliament deliberately meant to be experimental and temporary should be made perpetual by such a summary process as putting it into the schedule of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. Of course hon. Gentlemen would understand how the Irish Members felt on the question, but apart altogether from the fact that Acts dealing with fundamental rights in Ireland were included in the Bill, there were other questions, many of them accepted by both Parties in the House on the strict condition that their operation should be confined to a certain number of years, in order to see how they worked. That was a proper way to deal with many social experiments; and while he joined in the appeal to the Attorney General to say that measures which had practically become part of the constitution should not be subject to this process year by year, he wished to safeguard himself and his hon. friends against the idea that they would not regard it as a serious danger to make perpetual measures which Parliament in its wisdom had declared to be experimental and temporary.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT said he wished to assure his hon. friend who had just spoken that the very last idea they had was to force on any section of the House, by indirect means, measures which were objectionable to them. There was obviously a clear distinction between controversial Acts and Acts which were universally accepted. He wished to join in the appeal to the Attorney General, who he knew would be sympathetic, to remove what he considered a great blot on their mode of legislation. They were not only re-enacting a large number of obsolete Statutes, but were positively incorporating in the fourth column five or ten times as many extraneous references to other Acts of Parliament, and yet they acted on the assumption that the people were familiar with the law and were bound to obey it at their peril. That mode of legislation was a disgrace to the present century. They saw how Germany had devoted a very large sum of money, as well as the best minds in the country, to the preparation of a code. That course was also being taken in comparatively new countries like Egypt; and when they realised the great advantage to the French nation of the Code Napoleon, he thought the time had come when there should be, on the part of law reformers, the strongest possible protest against what he could only call a marine store mode of legislation. The present Bill was the penance which Parliament had to suffer for the scandalous mode in which so much of its legislation was effected. This patchwork kind of legislation was as discreditable to the Legislature as it was injurious to the best interests of the country.

Mr. ROBERT SPENCER (Northamptonshire, Mid.) said he quite agreed that the Ballot Act should be made permanent. He wished to ask the Attorney General, however, why the Sand Grouse Protection Act should only be extended for one year.

*The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman must discuss that on the Schedule.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said he agreed in the abstract with what his hon. friend said as to the Bill not being a desirable mode of legislation; but what had been said by the hon. Member for the Scotland Division showed that there was some difficulty in giving practical application to the very excellent principle which had been laid down by the hon. and learned Gentleman. To the main principle advanced he should be disposed to give his most entire and hearty assent; but he would point out that it was largely a matter of Parliamentary time, and that the subject was only one branch of the larger subject referred to by his hon. friend the Member for South Islington, viz., the codification of the law. He did not quite agree with his hon. friend as to the excellence of the Code Napoleon, as, when he had to look up a question of French law, he had to examine a mass of decisions. If we codified our laws it should be on a more complete and thorough plan than that of the Code Napoleon.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT said he would mention the Egyptian Code.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he thought the Egyptian Code was better than the Code Napoleon. With regard to the particular subject before the Committee, he did not think it could be looked upon apart from the general subject of which it was a branch. If that subject was to be dealt with, the House should be content to delegate to a Committee the task of dealing with the details.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Even as regards the Ballot Act ?

SIR. ROBERT FINLAY said that there were a number of other Acts, and the Committee would have to deal with the subject as a whole. The difficulties which would arise from an Act being made permanent involved questions of such nicety and detail that he could foresee several weeks of Parliamentary time being consumed in Committee of the Whole House on the subject. There was very great jealousy on the part of the House to delegate a task of that character, and as long as that jealousy continued, he was afraid that the prospects of codific ation were somewhat remote. He had the most entire sympathy with the general principle enunciated, but he could not undertake on behalf of the Government that the subject would be dealt with next session. No undertaking could be given until they knew how the House would be disposed to look at the larger question, and how much Parliamentary time would be available.

MR. O'SHEE said he desired to call attention to the fact that there was no reference whatever, except in the preamble of the Bill, to Part II. He asked for an explanation.

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Schedule be added to the Bill."

MR. FLYNN said that he handed in an Amendment to the schedule yesterday which was of a perfectly clear and comprehensible character. He now found that his Amendment appeared three times over, and each time referred to a different Act. His object was to omit the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1881; but he was also apparently inviting the Committee to omit the Corrupt Practices Act, 1854, and the Corrupt Practices Commission Expenses Act, 1869.

* THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Gentleman will state the lines in the Schedule he wishes to omit, I will call upon him.

MR. FLYNN said that although he handed in the Amendment in proper form it appeared in such a manner as to make him seem ridiculous.

* THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I can only judge by the Paper in my hands at the present moment, and in that I find that the hon. Gentleman proposes to leave out lines 30 and 31. If any hon. Gentleman has an Amendment before that, I will call on him.

MR. O'SHEE said he desired to omit in page 2, lines 39 and 40, which referred to the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1860. That Act, which was now obsolete, was to enable the Board of Works in Ireland to advance money to owners of land for the erection of labourers' cottages. Since the passing of the Act of 1883, he had never heard of the Act of 1860 being put into operation, although he was specially interested in the housing of agricultural labourers in Ireland, especially in Munster. If any hon. Member representing an Irish constituency would say that within his experience that Act had been used since 1883, he would withdraw his Amendment. The Act of 1883 put on the local authority the duty of providing labourers' cottages, and he did not see why an obsolete Act should be included in the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, to omit lines 39 and 40."—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

at present. He ventured to appeal to the Attorney General for an assurance that a different policy would be pursued in the future.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said he quite agreed with his hon. and learned friend that it was absurd that an Act like the Ballot Act, which had been accepted by all parties as one of the irrevocable laws of the country, should have to be renewed from year to year; but he strongly protested against the doctrine that legislation which Parliament deliberately meant to be experimental and temporary should be made perpetual by such a summary process as putting it into the schedule of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. Of course hon. Gentlemen would understand how the Irish Members felt on the question, but apart altogether from the fact that Acts dealing with fundamental rights in Ireland were included in the Bill, there were other questions, many of them accepted by both Parties in the House on the strict condition that their operation should be confined to a certain number of years, in order to see how they worked. That was a proper way to deal with many social experiments; and while he joined in the appeal to the Attorney General to say that measures which had practically become part of the constitution should not be subject to this process year by year, he wished to safeguard himself and his hon. friends against the idea that they would not regard it as a serious danger to make perpetual measures which Parliament in its wisdom had declared to be experimental and temporary.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT said he wished to assure his hon. friend who had just spoken that the very last idea they had was to force on any section of the House, by indirect means, measures which were objectionable to them. There was obviously a clear distinction between controversial Acts and Acts which were universally accepted. He wished to join in the appeal to the Attorney General, who he knew would be sympathetic, to remove what he considered a great blot on their mode of legislation. They were not only re-enacting a large number of obsolete Statutes, but were positively incorporating in the fourth column five or ten times as many extraneous references to other Acts of Parliament, and yet they acted on the assumption that the people were familiar with the law and were bound to obey it at their peril. That mode of legislation was a disgrace to the present century. They saw how Germany had devoted a very large sum of money, as well as the best minds in the country, to the preparation of a code. That course was also being taken in comparatively new countries like Egypt; and when they realised the great advantage to the French nation of the Code Napoleon, he thought the time had come when there should be, on the part of law reformers, the strongest possible protest against what he could only call a marine store mode of legislation. The present Bill was the penance which Parliament had to suffer for the scandalous mode in which so much of its legislation was effected. This patchwork kind of legislation was as discreditable to the Legislature as it was injurious to the best interests of the country.

Mr. ROBERT SPENCER (Northamptonshire, Mid.) said he quite agreed that the Ballot Act should be made permanent. He wished to ask the Attorney General, however, why the Sand Grouse Protection Act should only be extended for one year.

*The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman must discuss that on the Schedule.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said he agreed in the abstract with what his hon. friend said as to the Bill not being a desirable mode of legislation; but what had been said by the hon. Member for the Scotland Division showed that there was some difficulty in giving practical application to the very excellent principle which had been laid down by the hon. and learned Gentleman. To the main principle advanced he should be disposed to give his most entire and hearty assent; but he would point out that it was largely a matter of Parliamentary time, and that the subject was only one branch of the larger subject referred to by his hon. friend the Member for South Islington, viz., the codification of the law. He did not quite agree with his hon. friend as to the excellence of the Code Napoleon, as, when he had to look up a question of French law, he had to examine a mass of decisions. If we codified our laws it should be on a more complete and thorough plan than that of the Code Napoleon.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT said he would mention the Egyptian Code.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he thought the Egyptian Code was better than the Code Napoleon. With regard to the particular subject before the Committee, he did not think it could be looked upon apart from the general subject of which it was a branch. If that subject was to be dealt with, the House should be content to delegate to a Committee the task of dealing with the details.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Even as regards the Ballot Act ?

SIR. ROBERT FINLAY said that there were a number of other Acts, and the Committee would have to deal with the subject as a whole. The difficulties which would arise from an Act being made permanent involved questions of such nicety and detail that he could foresee several weeks of Parliamentary time being consumed in Committee of the Whole House on the subject. There was very great jealousy on the part of the House to delegate a task of that character, and as long as that jealousy continued, he was afraid that the prospects of codific ation were somewhat remote. He had the most entire sympathy with the general principle enunciated, but he could not undertake on behalf of the Government that the subject would be dealt with next session. No undertaking could be given until they knew how the House would be disposed to look at the larger question, and how much Parliamentary time would be available.

MR. O'SHEE said he desired to call attention to the fact that there was no reference whatever, except in the preamble of the Bill, to Part II. He asked for an explanation.

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Schedule be added to the Bill."

MR. FLYNN said that he handed in an Amendment to the schedule yesterday which was of a perfectly clear and comprehensible character. He now found that his Amendment appeared three times over, and each time referred to a different Act. His object was to omit the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1881; but he was also apparently inviting the Committee to omit the Corrupt Practices Act, 1854, and the Corrupt Practices Commission Expenses Act, 1869.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Gentleman will state the lines in the Schedule he wishes to omit, I will call upon him.

MR. FLYNN said that although he handed in the Amendment in proper form it appeared in such a manner as to make him seem ridiculous.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I can only judge by the Paper in my hands at the present moment, and in that I find that the hon. Gentleman proposes to leave out lines 30 and 31. If any hon. Gentleman has an Amendment before that, I will call on him.

MR. O'SHEE said he desired to omit in page 2, lines 39 and 40, which referred to the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1860. That Act, which was now obsolete, was to enable the Board of Works in Ireland to advance money to owners of land for the erection of labourers' cottages. Since the passing of the Act of 1883, he had never heard of the Act of 1860 being put into operation, although he was specially interested in the housing of agricultural labourers in Ireland, especially in Munster. If any hon. Member representing an Irish constituency would say that within his experience that Act had been used since 1883, he would withdraw his Amendment. The Act of 1883 put on the local authority the duty of providing labourers' cottages, and he did not see why an obsolete Act should be included in the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, to omit lines 39 and 40."—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said before the Amendment was disposed of it might be well to hear what the Attorney General for Ireland had to say on the subject.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) said that the Act of 1883 enabled loans to be made to the local authority for labourers' cottages, whereas the Act of 1860 enabled loans to be made to the owners of land for that purpose.

MR. T. P O'CONNOR asked if, as a matter of fact, any loan had been issued under the Act for years.

MR. ATKINSON said he could not answer that question offhand, but he thought that the Act of 1883 had to a great extent superseded the Act of 1860, but at the same time it was not desirable to repeal it.

Question put and agreed to.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON moved to omit in page 3, the Promissory Notes Act, 1863, and the Promissory Notes (Ireland) Act, 1864. It was suggested on the previous night that these Acts had been incorporated in the Bills of Exchange Act.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT said that his hon. friend was mistaken. The Acts dealt with the validity of promissory notes between £1 and £5, and, if repealed, there would be some doubt as to whether such notes were valid or not.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the Acts it was proposed to omit suspended the operation of certain other Acts, which restrained the issue of such notes. The proper way to deal with the matter would be, not to make the suspending Acts permanent, but to repeal the original Acts themselves.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) moved to omit from the Schedule the Prosecutions Expenses Act, 1866. He wished to know if the expenses of the prosecutions which were now taking place in Ireland were authorised under the Prosecutions Expenses Act, 1866. If that were the case it would be the duty of the Irish Members to have an explanation of some of the things that were now occurring in Ireland.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the Act did not apply to either Scotland or Ireland.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT said he should like to refer to the Locomotives Act, 1865, which he took as a sample of the kind o. legislation against which they were protesting. He had prepared a synopsis as to the effect of the Act now being extended for another year, and he found the state of the law, which everyone was assumed to know, was apparently as follows. By the provisions of the Act a person carrying a red flag was required to precede a locomotive. That provision was re-enacted with Amendments by the Highways and Locomotives Act, 1878, which, in its turn, was repealed by the Locomotives Act, 1898. He would ask the Committee whether they thought that it was a satisfactory state of the law to enact a penal statute for one year, which had been amended by four permanent Acts. He confessed he did not comprehend them all himself, yet the people were expected to understand the law and obey it. He fully appreciated the sympathetic expressions of the Attorney General, but it was time to give serious attention to this state of things, and if no steps were taken by the Government, or some one more qualified than he was, he certainly should endeavour next session to secure the appointment of a Select Committee to remedy this matter. He should not, however, move in the matter now.

MR. O'SHEE moved to omit from the Schedule the Locomotives Act, 1865. In Ireland they had steam-rollers in operation on the roads, and in front of each there was a man with a red flag. Experience in the rural parts of Ireland, however, showed that motor cars were far more dangerous in passing vehicles or pedestrians than steam-rollers; and unless a provision were inserted requiring a red flag to be carried before every motor car, he should object to the renewal of the Locomotives Act. It was unfair that a man should have to be employed to precede a steam-roller with a red flag, when they were told that County Councils had no right even to regulate the speed of motor cars at the present time. Some of the County Councils in Ireland endeavoured to ascertain from the Local Government Board if they had any power to regulate the speed of motor cars, but they were referred to some Department in England.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he hoped the Committee would not think it necessary to enter on a full discussion of the fascinating subject of motor cars. No doubt the law was not in an entirely satisfactory condition with reference to motor cars, but that was in a great measure due to the fact that the House insisted on dealing with the question itself; and he confessed he almost despaired of any satisfactory solution being arrived at until the House saw its way to appointing a strong Committee to consider the matter.

MR. FLYNN said he thought it was rather a large demand that a motor car should be preceded by a man carrying a red flag. Even a speed of ten or twelve miles an hour would be rather much for the man with the flag.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN said that for the protection of the public, he would suggest that every motor car should be preceded by the steam-roller, and every steam-roller by a man with a red flag.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

(10.10.) MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) moved to omit from the Schedule the Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) Act, 1875. He said this was a measure which was obviously passed by way of an experiment, and which was intended to be limited in its operation, in order to give the House an opportunity of expressing an opinion on its success or non-success. No hon. Member would deny that there was very good ground for an alteration in the law as far as this Act was concerned. First of all, he contended that the expenses of returning officers were in many cases too high. It was simply ridiculous that a presiding officer who might live only a few miles from the polling place should be entitled to charge expenses for three days. He should have thought that, in such a case, expenses for one day would be quite enough. Then as to ballot boxes, they went dancing about at five or six different Parliamentary elections, and each candidate had to pay for them. That ought not to be. Ballot boxes which were used three or four times ought not to be charged in every case as if they were new. Another objection he had to the Act was that it placed the expense of the election on the shoulders of the candidates. The elections were not the candidates' elections, but the elections of the country; and that candidates should have to pay for them seemed to him exceedingly unjust. It was not a Party matter at all, and was really expenditure which ought to be paid out of the National Exchequer, in which case the expenses would be kept much lower than they were at present. The fact that the expense of an election was so very high was a barrier in many cases to men taking their seats in the House of Commons, and if the Act were not renewed they would see a very much larger number of labour Members in the House than at present, to, he believed, the advantage of the House. Another point was that some reasonable notice ought to be given of the candidates who were to be nominated. At one of his own elections, no other candidate had even been mentioned up to the morning of election. He thought his return was perfectly secure, and on the day preceding the nomination he travelled to a place 200 miles from his constituency. He received an intimation that he had better be careful. He returned by the night train; and next day, not in the morning, but at one minute to one o'clock in the afternoon, a nomination paper was produced nominating a gentleman who had never been in the constituency. A somewhat similar case occurred in Ireland. It was thought that as he did not expect to be opposed, he might not have provided the necessary security; and if he had not taken the precaution he would have lost the election, and the constituency would be represented by a man it had never previously seen or heard of. It ought not to be possible to snatch a seat in such a manner, and he would therefore suggest that proper notice should be given of the candidates who were to be nominated before security was required. If the Committee refused to sanction the renewal of the Act, the Government would have to take definite action in the matter, and introduce a new Bill during the present session.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out lines 5 to 8, inclusive."—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

Question proposed, "That lines 5 to 8, inclusive, stand part of the Schedule."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he thought the Committee would be sensible that some provision must be made with regard to the expenses of returning officers in Parliamentary elections. No one would wish that the measure should be allowed to lapse, and on this Bill the provisions of the Act could not be amended.

MR. DALZIEL: Then, introduce a new Bill.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he ventured to submit to the hon. Member that that course would be very unreasonable. The hon. Member was very indignant with the law on the subject. He said that the expenses were excessive, and that candidates should not have to bear them. That opened up a very large question, on which it would be improper to enter on a Bill such as that before the Committee. Then the hon. Member referred to another matter, no doubt of great importance, but which had really little or no relation to the Act under consideration. He referred to notice being given of candidates to be nominated, but that did not depend on the Act.

MR. DALZIEL said the words of Act were "the end of the two hours appointed." His contention was that it should not be two hours but twenty-four hours.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the hon. Member wanted to amend the law relating to Parliamentary elections in order that twenty-four hours' notice or a week's or a month's notice, should be required before candidates were nominated. That might or might not be reasonable, but it could not now be dealt with. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would be satisfied with having expressed his views on the subject.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said the Attorney General had not told the Committee what would happen if the Bill were not renewed. It would not interfere with elections; it would simply mean that the expenses, in the first instance, would fall on the returning officers. It would therefore be necessary to pass a Bill immediately, or to let the returning officers bear the expense for a time, afterwards indemnifying them. It was simply a question of another Bill. As this was the only opportunity of protesting against an iniquitous and abominable system which was used for the benefit of propertied candidates, he should support the Amendment.

MR. O'SHEE supported the Amendment. The question of the payment of returning officers' expenses had been discussed for many years, and Labour candidates and organisations had over and over again claimed that those expenses should be paid out of the national exchequer. Irish Members suffered less from this grievance than Members from other parts of the United Kingdom, inasmuch as elections in Ireland were generally not contested, and the expenses consequently were small. But that was no reason why the Nationalists should not support the Amendment on the principle that no man ought to be debarred by his poverty from obtaining a seat in Parliament.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) said that, although this question had not been said to have a personal aspect for the Labour Members, he might be allowed to say that, in his opinion, the expenses of men who came to the House of Commons to do the country's work ought to be borne by the country. The House of Commons was not the worse, but the better, for the presence of the Labour Members, who in no way detracted from its dignity, or lessened the influence of its discussions. To take only one item—why should the ballot-boxes used in an election be charged to each candidate, seeing that the same boxes served for the election not in one constituency only, but in several? Before he could be nominated as a candidate he had to produce a deposit of £350. It was impossible for a man of his class to produce such a sum, and why should the society to which he belonged be burdened with so heavy a payment? He hoped an attempt would be made to take this burden off the shoulders of the individual candidate and place it either on the rates or the national exchequer.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR thought that, while the Attorney General was justified in saying that the present was not the proper opportunity for making such a change in the law as had been suggested, a promise might very well be given that the Government would seriously consider the existing state of the law. It was most desirable that the House of Commons should have within its walls representatives of every class of the community, and that no barrier whatever, especially of a pecuniary character, should be put in the way of such representation. There were a lot of trifling but vexatious expenses connected with elections which it was to the interest of nobody to maintain, and he hoped the subject would receive the attention of the Government.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) said he sympathised with the views which had been expressed on the other side, and he believed they were shared by many Unionist Members. It was a question not for Labour Members only, but for the nation at large. There should be no impediment placed in the way of any man becoming a candidate for a seat in this House.

(10.38.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 160; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 408.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh're
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Delany, William
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gilhooly, James
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Patrick James
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Leamy, Edmund
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'r'ry, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Shee, James John
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Richards, Henry Charles
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glam'rgan, Gower
Toulmin, George
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W.R.
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Dalziel and Mr. John Wilson (Durham).

(10.48.) MR. FLYNN moved the omission of the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1881. He described the title as a misnomer, and contended that the Act was in reality a peace-disturbing Act. When the Act was passed Ireland was in a state of peace and quietude, and now Ireland was still more peaceable. [At this stage the result of the Devonport election reached the House and was greeted with Ministerial cheers.] He begged to thank hon. Members opposite for the highly appreciative way in which they had received his remarks, and he was glad to see that even the Colonial Secretary joined in the jubilation. Irishmen did not enjoy even the liberty which Russia granted to her subjects, and in Cork or Dublin they were simply Outlanders in their own country, and they did not enjoy those equal rights which were the first privilege of free citizens. At a time when it was urged that in every hamlet and village rifle shooting should be practised, he was anxious to see men trained in the use of firearms in Ireland, and therefore he hoped that this disabling Act would be removed from the Statute-book. Even in South Africa the Government had been compelled by the duress of circumstances to allow the conquered Boers the right to carry arms, although by this Act they denied that right to the inhabitants of a nation who lived only three hours journey from the shores of this country. No Irishman had a right to carry an ordinary fowling piece to shoot crows with, without going before a removable magistrate appointed by the right hon. Gentleman, and humbly beseeching to have that right granted him. Not only this, but any ordinary constable had a right to take any man into custody if he suspected the concealment of arms. In such a case the constable could go and arrest all the inhabitants in a house in which the concealment of arms was suspected, even without a warrant. He might desire to carry a fowling piece to shoot pheasants, or snipe, or other game, but in order to do so he would have to go before a magistrate and prove that he was a loyal citizen of the highest possible character, and practically prove that he was a true blue. In any foreign country, such as France or Germany, an Act of this description would be denounced as tyranny incompatible with the freedom of the twentieth century. A young ragamuffin of the criminal class in London could purchase a pistol or a revolver without any trouble, but a respectable man in Ireland could not carry a revolver or cartridges, or even a fowling piece for sport, without going before the magistrate. Questions had been put by the Irish Members as to why a county councillor in Ireland who possessed the confidence of his fellow citizens could not obtain a licence to carry firearms. He went before a removable magistrate, who refused to grant him a licence to keep a gun which he required to scare away the crows from his fields. Could they find an example of tyranny plainer than that? Upon certain dates in July and August each year, they heard of His Majesty's subjects firing off cannon in the North of Ireland. What became of those cannon for the rest of the year? If it was an offence to carry a fowling piece, surely it was a greater offence to fire off cannon. They all knew that those cannon were concealed somewhere, but they never heard of any arrests in connection with them. Irishmen were not allowed the right to carry firearms even to protect their own property. He protested against this Act as it was protested against twenty years ago when it was first passed. The Act was then quite uncalled for, but it was now ten times more uncalled for than it was before, and it had become an insult to Irishmen.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out lines 30 and 31."—(*Mr. Flynn.*)

Question proposed, "That lines 30 and 31 stand part of the Schedule."

MR. WYNDHAM said that anyone who listened to the opening of the hon. Member's speech must have supposed that the Irish nation had no outlet for its martial proclivities. The hon. Member was under a misapprehension if he believed that to be the case. Reference had been made to the institution of rifle clubs, but he had to point out to the hon. Member that when he was at the War Office he took care that rifle clubs should be allowed to be established just the same in Ireland as in England. No distinction had been made between Ireland and England in respect of rifle clubs, and the Irish Militia had rendered very good service in South Africa. It was also said that this was a specially tyrannical Act which ought not to be continued for a day longer on the statute-book. It had often been pointed out that the present Government succeeded to this Act as a heritage from their predecessors. It was originally introduced by Mr. Gladstone's Government in 1881, and he believed it was brought in by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: No, by Mr. Forster, well-known as "Buckshot" Forster.

MR. WYNDHAM said the hon. Gentleman opposite was generally correct in regard to these matters, but he thought that in this case he was mistaken. It was brought in for five years, and it was continued in 1886 by the predecessors of the present Government under the auspices of the right hon. Member for the Montrose Burghs. In 1887 the Conservative Party came into office, and they continued the Act for another five years, to be incorporated for that period in the Criminal Law and Procedure Act. In 1892 the right hon. Member for the

Montrose Burghs again became responsible for the government of Ireland. Did he withdraw this Act as a measure of tyranny, insult, and injury to the people of Ireland? No; he was asked to do so by the hon. Member for South Tyrone, who objected to the Peace Preservation Act as a measure of coercion. But the right hon. Member for the Montrose Burghs said that it was a measure of police regulation. He associated himself with the sentiments of the right hon. Gentleman, and he regarded the Peace Preservation Act as a wise measure of police regulation applicable to the conditions of Ireland. The hon. Member opposite took special exception not only to the existence of this Act but to the tribunal which had administered it. There again he doubted whether the hon. Gentleman had studied the previous history of this Act, because in 1898 an Amendment was moved to it and supported by the hon. Member for East Mayo, providing that the jurisdiction under this Act should be reconstituted. Therefore, he had the authority of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Montrose Burghs for the necessity of the Act, and in support of the tribunal he quoted the hon. Member for East Mayo, who was still with them, although at the present time he was occupied in America. He doubted if any one acquainted with the operation of this Act could maintain that it was tyrannical in its character. Last year the number of licences to carry arms granted in Ireland up to the 30th of June was 6,089, and the number of licences refused was only 619, or about 9 per cent of the entire number of applications. The number of licences revoked was thirty-one. Therefore more than 6,000 people applied and were allowed to carry arms, and he thought that ought to meet the demand for legitimate personal defence or sporting purposes. It had been said that under this Act the Government instituted a number of vexatious prosecutions and inflicted penalties of a severe character. That was not so. Last night they listened to a very interesting historical speech from the hon. Member opposite, and he laid great stress upon the fact that in the year 1873-74 a certain eminent statesman on the Conservative side held the view that the Peace Preservation Act should no longer be embodied in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. It seemed to him that they were bound by precedents in this matter, but if the other doctrine were to be accepted, and he did not think it had ever been accepted, at any rate let it be reciprocal. Originally under the Act of 1844, the penalty was two years imprisonment with hard labour. That was modified by the Act of 1856 to one year with hard labour. The present Act imposed a maximum penalty of three months imprisonment without hard labour, with the alternative of a fine not exceeding £20. He would ask the House to consider how these penalties had been imposed. In 1901, there were thirty-two prosecutions, of which three were withdrawn and six resulted in acquittals. Of the remainder, terms of imprisonment were imposed in three cases only, the other delinquents being fined small sums. There was nothing exceptional in the Act, or tyrannical in its administration.

(11.12.) MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said he was in the House of Commons twenty-one or twenty-two years ago, when this Act was passed for the first time. It was enacted for five years. The Chief Secretary was not accurate in stating that the Bill was brought in by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire. It was brought in by the late Mr. Forster, who was then Chief Secretary, but the Member for West Monmouthshire was one of the persons responsible, he being in the Government. On that occasion, the hon. Member made a speech in which he quoted from a speech made by the Member for West Monmouthshire strongly protesting against the action of a Conservative Administration in prolonging the Act for more than three years. In 1885, three years were considered sufficient, but now, such was the progress of Irish liberty, it was considered quite in accord with the eternal fitness of things, that the Act should be made perpetual. The progress of the regard and respect for Irish liberty in this House was quite on the same lines as the progress of the population of Ireland, and the prosperity of the Irish people. He felt some curiosity as to the kind of defence which the Chief Secretary would make for this measure. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the fact that the Member for the Montrose Burghs refused the request that it should not be renewed when asked by the hon. Member for South Tyrone. But surely the Chief Secretary knew what the state of Ireland was at that time. There were scenes of violence and bloodshed going on in Belfast. He was informed that at that time a large section of the population of the North of Ireland was armed, and that they were able to use their arms, not in bloodshed, but rather in alarming the people who differed from them. The reason in favour of restraining the granting of licences for arms then lay in the almost rebellious condition of the North of Ireland—a state of rebellion which was largely brought about by the inspiriting eloquence of a Conservative statesman who visited Belfast about that period. He did not say that Belfast was quiet now, but it was comparatively so. Its energies had taken a religious rather than a political turn. Now, they were told that Ulster would fight and that Ulster would be right—not in preventing a measure of self-government for Ireland, but to save that province from the wiles and machinations of a Jesuitical Government which had brought forward the Education Bill. He was not concerned to stand between the Government and their Protestant assailants in the city of Belfast. He understood from the public Press that one result of this suspicion of the Protestantism of the Government had been the return to Parliament of a Gentleman who was entirely outside the orthodox pale of the Conservative organisation in that city. But that was a domestic quarrel which he had no desire to enter. It was not his business or duty to give the Government a character for the thoroughness of their Protestantism. That was a matter he would leave them to fight out with their own supporters. The reason that existed for the Arms Act in those days was the rebellious state of Belfast on political grounds, but that argument was no longer to be found in the condition of that belligerent and exuberant province. As a matter of fact, they could all in that House go to all the weddings of all their friends for the next ten years without going to the hosier's if they could only get possession of the white gloves which were being presented to the judges, both of the High Courts and the County Courts. The Chief Secretary was not justified in applying to the Irish people a disarmament law which had not been applied to the people of the Transvaal even after three years' war. What did the Chief Secretary say in reply? He said there were plenty of opportunities in Ireland for the outlet of that martial spirit which the Irish people had. He spoke of the deeds of valour of the Militia in South Africa, but he passed by the deeds of valour of the Irish Yeomanry there. Was the argument about the Militia one which the right hon. Gentleman really put forward seriously? They knew that the British Government was quite ready to buy Irish valour at 1s. per day, and that when the Irish soldier had risked his life and lost his livelihood, this generous Government allowed him to end his days in the Irish workhouse. All these facts were perfectly familiar, but they were not relevant to the question of the disarmament of the Irish people. The right hon. Gentleman said they had the privilege of raising rifle clubs in Ireland if they got the sanction of the National Rifle Association in London. What a privilege that was for Ireland! Either the people of Ireland were contented or discontented with the Government of this country. If they were discontented he could quite understand that the right hon. Gentleman should demand a disarmament Act; but let him not say at the same time that the liberties and rights of the two countries were the same. They all knew that this Act was an instrument of tyranny in the hands of the authorities in Ireland. It was a Coercion Act, an Act in restraint of the liberties of the people, and it was a monstrous use of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill to pass a Coercion Act among a number of obsolete Acts.

(11.30.) MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said he desired to say a few words on this measure as regarded its sectional operation. Let them assume for the purpose of argument, which of course he denied, that this Act had some value for executive purposes, and let them look at the partial manner in which it was applied. Take the recent case of the proposed incursion of the Orange party into Rostrevor. Rostrevor was a purely Catholic district. He should think that nine-tenths of the people were Catholic, but being in close proximity to Belfast, and not in a proclaimed district of the country, it was possible for Orangemen by excursion trains to pour thousands of armed men into the Rostrevor area. The Government did proclaim it on 12th of July last, but the hon. Gentleman lately elected a Member of this House for one of the Divisions of Belfast [Mr. Sloan] had stated that at whatever peril he would on the next 12th of July, the date when the Orangemen of Ireland celebrated the battle of the Boyne or some other battle, insist on going to Rostrevor and holding a meeting there. They all knew, in the immortal words of Dean Swift, that "ten men armed to the teeth are more than a match for one man in his shirt," and if ten thousand Orangemen come down from Belfast, or anywhere else, into the little Catholic village of Rostrevor with rifles and arms, he really did not see what prospect there was for the Catholic people of the district, the nuns of the district, and the Catholic priests of the religious institutions of that district. He did not see what force the Government could oppose to that loyal body. Even if they assumed that this measure was a necessity to the government of Ireland, its operation was so partial and so unjust, that it really became, for those Catholics who lived on the borderland of this unhappy district, a very serious thing. Those Orangemen were always thinking of William III., or Queen Anne, and persons who had been dead for a long period, and whose microbes still disturbed the Orange intelligence. It was really a serious thing for the Catholics in this district to be prohibited by the Government from arming themselves and preventing aggression under the circumstances of the case. He had noticed ever since the Chief Secretary took office that when the Nationalists attacked him it was on perfectly sound grounds, but when the Orangemen attacked him it was not for giving them hard labour, or making them bankrupt. The ground of the Orange attack was that he had not permitted them to murder the Catholics. He had read most powerful denunciations of the Chief Secretary, assailing him because he did not permit the Rostrevor demonstration, and threatening him with what would happen on the next occasion when this anniversary came round. Did he think these Orangemen would be so keen to come into Catholic districts if they thought that the Catholics could shoot straight, or if they had the means of repelling these aggressions? He absolutely deplored and deprecated in every way the keeping up of these animosities, and he was amazed that sensible men could have anything to do with them. But Privy Councillors like the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh put themselves at the head of these armed bands, and by appealing to the Bible and to "the Sword of the Lord and of Gideon," and all these considerations, on the date of these anniversaries, worked up these unhappy people in order to assail by vituperation and assault their fellow citizens. In the South of Ireland there were absolutely no arms except those carried by returning emigrants in their trunks, and these were immediately taken from them at Queenstown. The North of Ireland was the only region where, since the rebellion of 1798, anybody had been killed in political strife. In Belfast, County Down, Armagh, and Antrim there were regions which were not proclaimed, and here they had a whole district absolutely incited by these incitements to come down and slay their fellow countrymen. And these organisations were headed by the supporters of the right hon. Gentleman opposite who were the adornment of law and order in Ireland. Was that a fair position of affairs? This Arms Act was a relic of the times when Ireland was supposed to be, in some way, formidable and dangerous to this country. Why, since the invention of the modern rifle, not to speak of the pom-poms and Maxim guns, the pretence that from a military point of view an unarmed and even an unorganised people could ever be formidable to this country was absurd How did Mr. Gladstone get round Lord Spencer in 1881, when he was hesitating upon this Home Rule Question? Mr. Gladstone said that if Ireland gave the least trouble to England when she became organised under an Irish Parliament, England could tow Ireland after it as a battleship could tow a cockboat, and that was as true today as it was true sixteen years ago. So that if every Irishman possessed a Mauser rifle the notion that they could do anything against the might of England when battleships could enter Dublin Bay on one side and Galway Bay on the other, and shoot cannon balls that would meet at Athlone, was, from a military point of view, a grotesque absurdity, and from a military point of view this Bill was archæological. Therefore this Bill could only be important to the Government from the point of view of the prevention of crime. How did Ireland stand in regard to crime? They had at this moment in Ireland an organisation which was striving to the utmost of its ability to prevent crime, but in addition to that they had the fact that owing to the passage of Land Acts agrarian crime had positively disappeared from the country. If they wanted to commit the crime of murder they could buy in the Strand a rifle about two feet long for 15s., which would put a bullet in a landlord just as well as a blunderbuss 6 ft. long. There was no means which he knew of for preventing people determined to commit crime from possessing themselves of weapons of this character. They had come now to the days of Maxim guns and smokeless powder, and weapons of facility and precision, and the notion that this particular Bill did anything to keep Ireland quiet and subdued was a view borrowed from the last century. One word more. He did think the Tory Party had in the arguments against Home Rule had a most chameleon set of contentions, which changed their lines according to the kind of attack made upon them. Had the Tory Party who pretended that Ireland was an integral portion of the British Empire, no shame when they said that they themselves were proclaiming the necessity of promoting the martial qualities of the people, in keeping up year after year in the form these Bills had now taken, this disability, which, as he had shown, had no grounds of military or civil justification, and which operated in the North of Ireland as an incitement to assassination upon a defenceless population? If the Tory Party meant to rule Ireland as an integral part of the United Kingdom, they should endeavour to give Irishmen some of the laws that existed in their own country. He did not profess himself to speak the English language with any facility or any accuracy, but he generally made himself fairly understood. But the Welsh people—a people as Celtic as the Irish—spoke the Welsh language, and even here on these Benches when the Welsh Members conversed with each other they talked Welsh. Now the Welsh people might be a thorn in the side of England, and were just as national in their views as the Irish, and yet England did not hesitate to give them all the rights which they give to the British people. Why then was it that in regard to the Irish nation the Chief Secretary did not attempt to take an original view? They had known Cabinets to go on year after year, but generally after two years they found some Cabinet Minister slain on the altar of his country, and resigning his office. But had anyone known an Irish Secretary resign office? He invited the right hon. Gentleman to give proof that there was no justification for the assaults upon him from that side. He had sent Irish Members to the plank bed; he had made speeches with which they could not agree. Some people believed that he was fighting a lone hand in the Cabinet. Why did he not now, on the question of Ireland, take the view of modernity? Mr. Forster was dead; Mr. Pitt was no more; the right hon. Member for West Monmouth was no longer the leader of the Liberal Party. From the Tory point of view would he not take on his responsibility, as a statesman, some new line in regard to this matter? The landlords were not helping him, and why then should he consent, year after year, to tread this miserable beaten path, strewn as it was with all these records of failure, in regard to this small and petty measure? Why did he not take the stand of Disraeli, Sir Stafford Northcote, and Sir M. Hicks-Beach, and as a Conservative statesman prefer to follow in their footsteps, and if the Arms Act must be renewed, let him, at any rate, give the Irish Members an opportunity of discussing the matter and of making the measure a battle-horse on which the Irish Members could make their assault.

*Mr. HUGH LAW said that the Chief Secretary had not put forward any positive argument for the continuance of this Act; his argument had been merely negative. He could not but think that it almost amounted to a fraud on the House that a Bill of this character should be continued year after year under circumstances which were entirely different from those which existed when the House was induced to pass it originally. He wanted to contrast the position taken up by the Government when the

Act was first passed with that assumed when they now asked for its continuance. In asking leave to introduce this measure originally, the Home Secretary of the day was able to point to the fact that Judge Fitzgerald had declared that Ireland was in a state little different from civil war. Now, as had been clearly shown by the hon. Member for Scotland Division, Ireland was absolutely crimeless. Then, on the Second Reading of the Bill the Solicitor General for Ireland gave the House some extraordinary particulars as to the state of the country. In the county of Kerry a band of fifty disguised men roamed over the district at night, entered houses, and carried away forty guns, besides money; and at Loughrea another band of 150 men, armed, had made a raid. The Solicitor General went on to say that the Government had asked simply to be armed with powers to deprive would-be murderers of their weapons; and at the end of his speech he said that the Act would only be put in force where it was absolutely necessary for the preservation of peace that the people should be disarmed. Could the Government positively and definitely assure Parliament that the state of Ireland was today anything like it was in 1881? He therefore maintained that it was an abuse of the forms of the House to pass an Act of this sort in a Continuance Bill which was originally framed to meet a wholly different condition of affairs.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) said he regretted that the short time at his disposal would not permit him to draw attention at length to the neglect of the Government to prevent the firing of revolvers from trains on the occasion of Orange demonstrations. Nearly a quarter of a century ago the Government of the day assured the House that this matter was receiving their careful consideration, and, when this year a similar question was put to the Chief Secretary, the same reply was made. He supposed that twenty-five years hence they should have another English gentleman getting up and telling the House that the matter was receiving the careful consideration of the Government. Everybody knew how Orange demonstrations were got up in Ireland. Men were imported from all parts of the country, most of them armed, and all of them drunk; and these gentlemen fired off revolvers in the gaiety of their hearts, but no prosecutions followed. There was an Orange demonstration where a young Catholic was shot, and the evidence of the police was that the Orangemen had carried away with them sackfuls of rifles. Yet they were told that the Act was impartially administered! In the columns of the *Dublin Daily Express*, the organ of the landlords in Ireland, there appeared a description of an Orange demonstration.

> "Some pistol shots," it was stated, "were fired in the air in the outskirts of the crowd, and immediately the fire was taken up by several hundreds of persons. Pistols and rifles were produced on all sides, and a continuous fusillade was carried on for fifteen minutes, which the Orange leaders vainly endeavoured to stop. And one would have thought he was the spectator of a sham fight. The police tried to stop the display, which the Orangemen regarded as a splendid joke."

Then, this year revolver shots were fired from an Orange excursion train at Newry, and several people were wounded. Only one arrest was made, and although the man had his pockets stuffed with cartridges, the magistrate discharged him because it had not been proved that he had any intention of killing anybody! In the south of Ireland, if a man was found with a revolver in his pocket he would be sentenced to the plank bed. He noticed that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh, had been making a speech in his constituency in which he attacked the hon. Member for South Belfast because that hon. Member had announced his intention of marching over to Rome at the head of an army of Orangemen to drive the Pope from his throne. He should think that that hon. Member would have to march at the head of a very formidable body of men to do that. It was perfectly manifest to anyone who watched the administration of the Arms Act in Ireland that it was used in the most one-sided manner. In the north of Ireland any Orangeman could get a permit to carry arms from the magistrate at once.

(11.57.) MR. WYNDHAM rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 162; Noes, 76. (Division List No. 409.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, John Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'er
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Rt Hn L'rd G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, H. C. (N'th'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph

Doogan, P. C.
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Ffrench, Peter
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Patrick James
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Leamy, Edmund
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'r'ry, Mid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Shee, James John
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glam'rgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

(12.3.) Question put accordingly, "That lines 30 and 31 stand part of the Schedule."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 160; Noes, 75. (Division List No. 410.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J. A (Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Charles Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn. G R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Jos'ph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Long, Rt. Hon Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.
Moore. William (Antrim, N.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert

Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B(Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, H. C. (N'th'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Ffrench, Peter
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Patrick James
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Leamy, Edmund
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'r'ry, Mid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Shee, James John
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David Alf. (Merthyr)
Thomas, J A (Glam'rgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)

Tellers for the Noes—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

(12.18.) Mr. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, "That this be the Schedule to the Bill."

Question put, "That this be the Schedule to the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 158; Noes 74. (Division List No. 411.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J A (Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlts
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.)
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hope, J. F. (Sh'ffield, Brights'de
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, F'versh'm
Johnstone, Heywood
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (W'lthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. (Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, H. C. (N'th'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Ffrench, Peter
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Patrick James
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Leamy, Edmund
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'r'ry, Mid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Shee, James John
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas. J A (Gl'morgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

It being after midnight, and objection being taken to further proceedings, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at half after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 23rd October, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) drew attention to a Question on the Paper standing in the name of the hon. Member for North Antrim, asking the Home Secretary if he was in a position to make a statement on the precedence of the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, and contended that, although it was not actually beyond the practice of this House, yet it was a most objectionable departure from ordinary Parliamentary usage. The question did not come within the province of the Home Secretary, except in a technical sense.

*Mr. SPEAKER said the Home Secretary himself could take objection to the Question when it was put to him.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL added that it was within the hon. Member's own knowledge, as he had raised the question on the Vote for the Irish Secretary's salary. The hon. Member was the Parliamentary Secretary of the Chief Secretary, and it was a put-up Question between the two.

*Mr. SPEAKER said the hon. Member was now making more or less a personal attack.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Oh no, Sir.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member's first objection seems to be that the Question has been addressed to the wrong Minister. That is a matter that can be dealt with by the Minister himself. The other objection is apparently that the hon. Member who has given notice of the Question is Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Minister who is asked the Question. As to that, I dare say that the hon. Member is quite right in saying that it is unusual. It is unusual because it is not usually found to be necessary. If an hon. Member puts such a Question down he is perfectly within his rights.

Mr. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.): This is a mare's nest. I am Parlimentary Secretary to the Chief Secretary, and my Question is addressed to the Home Secretary. I may add that I am not surprised at the hon. Member attacking me in my absence.

*Mr. SPEAKER: If I had known what the hon. Member's point was I should have stopped him sooner.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: As a personal explanation, I think I was more than justified in bringing the matter forward, inasmuch as the hon. Member on 23rd July actually raised this point on the Vote for the Chief Secretary's salary.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of York, North Riding (Cleveland Division), in the room of Alfred Edward Pease, Esquire (Manor of Northstead).—(*Mr. Herbert Gladstone.*)

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY *v.* THE LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.

Petition of Mr. R. Hill Dane, solicitor for the Great Northern Railway Company, praying for leave for the proper officer to attend at an Arbitration and produce documents.

Leave given to the proper officer to attend accordingly.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

PICCADILLY, CITY AND NORTH-EAST LONDON RAILWAYS BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Special Report [Preamble not proved.]

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for the abolition of restrictions: from Lennoxtown; Bridgwater;

Banbury; Chipping Norton; Glasgow; Sittingbourne; Faversham; Kilnhurst; Paisley; Bonnybridge; Camelon; Teynham; Coalville; Buckley; Ewlse Place; Ilkeston; Stockton-on-Tees; West London; Willington Quay; Walker; Harwood; Darwen; Wallsend; Chepstow; Seaham; Skelton; Guisborough; Skinningrove; Amble; Loftus; Cambois; and Buckfastleigh; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Strathbogie; Highbridge; Puriton; Bridgwater (two); North Petherton; Scarborough; North Staffordshire; Clophill; Suffolk; West Cranmore; and Bradford; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Buckley; Ewlse Place; Ilkeston; Stockton-on-Tees; West London; Great Harwood; Wallsend; Chepstow; Seaham Harbour; Willington Quay; Skelton; Guisborough; Amble; Skinningrove; Loftus; Uddingston; Dalziel; Newarthill; and Buckfastleigh; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Two Petitions from Kirkdale, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

HOSPITALS (EXEMPTION FROM RATES) (RECOMMENDATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE).

Petition from Liverpool, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (REPAYMENT OF LOANS) (RECOMMENDATIONS OF SELECT COMMITTEE).

Petition from Liverpool, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: from Buckley; Ewlse Place; Ilkeston; Great Harwood; Newington Green; West London; Stockton-on-Tees; Walker; Wallsend; Willington Quay; Darwen; Chepstow; Seaham Harbour; Skelton; Guisborough; Skinningrove; Amble; Loftus; Cambois; and Buckfastleigh; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Wolverhampton, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF TOBACCO TO JUVENILES.

Petition from Edinburgh, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIAL STATISTICS.

Copy presented, of Statistical Tables relating to the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom. Part XXV. for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (COLONIES).

Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1887 to 1901, Thirty-ninth Number [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

Copy presented, of Return of Proceedings during the month of August, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889.

Copy presented, of Minutes sanctioning the Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act, for the following counties: —County of Huntingdon (Second Minute), dated 11th September, 1902; County of East Suffolk (Seventh Minute), dated 29th July, 1902; County of Southampton (Tenth Minute), dated 11th September, 1902; County of Oxford (Eighth Minute), dated 11th September, 1902; County of Leicester (Seventh Minute), dated 11th September 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (IRELAND) (POPULATION).

Return ordered, "giving the population (1891 and 1901) valuation, according to counties and poor law unions, of the various districts scheduled as congested in Ireland, in the following form :—

Electoral Division.	Poor Law Union.	County.	Valuation.	Population, 1891.	Population, 1901.	Number of house-holders under £5 valuation.

(Mr. Thomas O'Donnell.)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Indian Mutiny—Confiscated Estate of the Dewan of Dhar.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India, seeing that the property belonging to Ramchandra Rao, one of the six sons of Bapu Raghunath, Dewan of Dhar, was confiscated in November, 1857, on account of Ramchandra's alleged complicity in the Mutiny, will he ascertain what has become of the property belonging to the other sons of Bapu Raghunath, and why the claims of his other descendants, viz., Krishna Rao Raghunath, son of a younger brother of Ramchandra, and Shanka Rao Bhagwant, grandson of another brother of Ramchandra, are not recognised by the Dhar State.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) I must refer the hon. Member to my previous answers in May and July last to his questions on the subject.*

Indian Food Crops Statistics.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India, in view of the statement contained in his Budget speech last year to the effect that the yield of food crops per acre in India had increased from 730 lbs. in 1880 to 840 lbs. in 1900, will he give the statistics on this point for each province of India.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The statement made in my Budget speech last year repeated certain estimates of produce prepared in India from data collected by the Famine Commission of 1898. The detailed figures, as I have received them from India, are as follow :—

	1880.		1901.	
	Food crop area.	Produce of food grains.	Food crop area.	Produce of food grains.
	Acres.†	Tons.	Acres.†	Tons.
Madras - - - - - - -	26,244	8,897	27,532	10,206
Bombay and Sindh - - - - -	21,500	4,086	23,223	6,092
Bengal - - - - - - -	48,500	17,460	50,596	24,407
N.W. Provinces and Oudh - - -	31,450	11,322	35,912	12,250
Punjab - - - - - - -	88,900	5,446	21,316	5,966
Central Provinces - - - - -	13,000	2,750	14,000	3,000
Lower Burma, Assam, etc. - - -	6,920	4,347	9,850	6,266
Total - - -	166,514	54,308	182,429	68,187

---

* See (4) *Debates*, cvii., 1342; cx., 1372.

†(The figures are in thousands, 000 omitted.)

Commission on Indian Police Administration.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether a Commission has yet been appointed to inquire into the Police Administration in India; and, if so, will the treatment of third class native passengers on Indian Railways by the police be inquired into.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) A Commission has been appointed to inquire into Police Administration in India. One of the subjects to be inquired into is whether the existing organisation of the Railway Police is in a satisfactory condition; and, if not, what improvements can be effected. If there are any complaints regarding the treatment of native passengers by the police, they will doubtless be brought to the notice of the Commission.

Auxiliary Postmen, E. C. District—Holiday Pay.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Postmaster General whether the temporary and auxiliary postmen employed at the E.C. district office received the same pecuniary consideration for duties performed on 9th August (Coronation Day) as that received by the other members of the staff; and, if not, what are the reasons for the different treatment.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) Temporary postmen employed in the Eastern Central District on full duties received the same extra payment for their attendance on the Bank Holiday of 9th August as the established staff. On inquiry I fear that there has been some misapprehension as regards the payment of auxiliary postmen in the Eastern Central District for Bank Holidays, but I have received no representations on the subject from the men concerned. I am having the matter investigated.

Ballina Post Office.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): To ask the Postmaster General if he has received any communication from the Ballina Urban Council relating to the proposed change of the post office in that town to a new site.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I have received a communication from the urban district council of Ballina maintaining their objection to the removal of the post office from Knox Street to King Street, and suggesting the purchase of a site in Knox Street and the erection of a new building. This, however, is an arrangement which would be more expensive than the circumstances justify; the King Street scheme has therefore been sanctioned.

Ballymoney Post Office.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.): To ask the Postmaster General if he will state the position of the negotiations by the Department towards acquiring a site for a post office in Ballymoney.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) No negotiations are going on at present for the acquisition of a site for a new post office at Ballymoney. The office there has recently been enlarged, and no difficulty is experienced in carrying on the business in the present building.

Education Bill—Control of Local Authority.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the local education authority to be established under the Education Bill will have control over the selection and arrangement of furniture, the granting of holidays, the imposition and remission of fees, the provision of certificates and prizes, and the provision of school libraries.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) It is not convenient to answer questions as to the interpretation of a Bill which is under discussion in Committee. But, so far as secular instruction is concerned, the control of the local authority over the expenditure required for maintaining public elementary schools is complete.

China Operations, 1900—Gratuities.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether any gratuity is to be given to the men who were engaged in operations in China in 1900; and, if so, what conditions are to be observed.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) A gratuity will be granted to the Naval and Marine forces engaged in the operations in North China and in the Yangtse Valley from June, 1900, to 31st December, 1900, similar to that awarded to His Majesty's land forces. The Army unit of 24 rupees a share will be adopted and the gratuity paid, as in the case of the troops, to all employed, irrespective of the nature of the services rendered by them, subject only to the proviso that no person shall receive the gratuity in addition to the Pekin prize money unless his share of the prize money be less than his share of the gratuity, in which case the difference between the two amounts will be paid to him. It is expected that the distribution of the gratuity will commence about the beginning of November.

Licensing Act, 1902.—Home Office Regulations.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somerset, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, if he intends to make and issue, for the guidance of police authorities, any model regulations for the purpose of securing the giving of information and the identification of convicted persons under Section 6 (3) of the Licensing Act, 1902.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)—I have now under consideration the regulations to be made by me under Section 6 (3) of the Licensing Act, 1902, as police authority for the Metropolitan Police District; and I hope to be able, in a few days time, to forward copies of these regulations to the various police authorities, to whom they may be of assistance.

Stranding of the "Islay."

MR. BAIRD (Glasgow, Central): To ask the President of the Board of Trade, why no inquiry has been held into the loss of the steamship "Islay" off Port Ellen on 15th September; and whether he will have an investigation made into the circumstances attending the loss and the causes of the delay in lowering the boats after the vessel struck.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) A preliminary inquiry, which was held in the case to which my hon. friend refers disclosed the fact that the cause of the stranding was the density of the fog, and, possibly, a slight error of judgment on the part of the master. The crew and passengers were safely landed by the ship's boats without any mishap, and the weather being still and the sea smooth there was no necessity for undue haste in lowering the boats, which were reported by the Board of Trade Surveyor as being in good order and easily handled when last surveyed.

Lighthouse Authorities Accounts.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will say when the accounts of the General Lighthouse Fund for the year ending 31st March, 1902, will be presented to this House; when each of the three lighthouse authorities rendered its accounts for the year ending 31st March, 1902, to the Board of Trade; when these accounts were sent by the Board of Trade to the Auditor General; when the Board of Trade received his certificate; and, if it has not yet been received, when the Board of Trade expects to receive it.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The lighthouse authorities render their accounts quarterly. Those for the quarter ending 31st March, 1902, were received at the Board of Trade at different dates during the months of May and June. The accounts are forwarded by the Board of Trade to the Auditor General in instalments so soon as they have been examined, the first instalment having been sent on the 26th May and the last on the 4th September. The full annual account is sent when the Board hear that the Comptroller and Auditor General has completed his examination of the last instalment.

Hours of Railway Servants Return.

MR. BELL (Derby): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state when the Return of Hours Worked by Railway Servants, now in course of preparation, will be presented to the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) This Return was presented on the 14th instant. I understand that it will be circulated very shortly.

Port of London Commission Report.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he proposes to take any, and, if so, what course of action in reference to the Report of the Royal Commission on the Port of London; and whether he will use his influence to obtain facilities for a discussion of the subject upon the Motion of which notice appears upon the Vote Paper.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) This subject is at present engaging the attention of the Government, and I am not yet in a position to make any statement with regard to it.

Lehud (Kerry) Fishing Harbour.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the statement of the necessity for improving the entrance to the harbour at Lehud, County Kerry, lately submitted by the local fishermen to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who resides in the district, and whether the Congested Districts Board will allocate a portion of the funds at its disposal in the next financial year for the necessary improvements, seeing that the application has been before the Board for a considerable period.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) If a suitable scheme for the proposed works be submitted to the Congested Districts Board by the County Council, the Board will consider the question of making a contribution towards the cost.

Belfast Police.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of officers, head constables, sergeants, and men of the Royal Irish Constabulary stationed in the City of Belfast, and to what particular denomination do they separately belong.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The religious distribution of the force in Belfast on the 31st December was as follows:—

	Roman Catholics.	Presbyterians.	Episcopalians and other Denominations.	Total.
Commissioner	—	—	1	1
District Inspectors	2	1	3	6
Head Constables	11	2	9	22
Sergeants	50	30	61	141
Acting Sergeants	10	2	12	24
Constables	380	110	277	767
Total...	453	145	363	961

On the 30th June the force was increased by 100 men, of whom fifty were Roman Catholics, forty-one Episcopalians, and nine Presbyterians.

Newry Police.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of head constables, sergeants, and men of the Royal Irish Constabulary stationed in Newry, and to what particular denomination do they separately belong.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) One district inspector, two head constables, two sergeants, three acting sergeants, and twenty-six constables. The district inspector and five constables are Episcopalians, two constables Presbyterians, and the remainder are Roman Catholics.

Piers and Harbours in North Mayo.

Mr. CONOR O'KELLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any decision has yet been come to in connection with the claims of North Mayo to grants from the new piers and harbours fund; and, if not, if he is in a position to say when a decision may be come to.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) No decision has yet been arrived at. The Government hopes to be in a position to give effect to the provisions of the recent Act at an early date.

Irish Railway and Harbour Guarantees Return.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Return granted on the 6th August, dealing with Railway and Harbour Guarantees (Ireland) is yet ready; and, if not, what is the cause of the delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) There has been no avoidable delay in the preparation of the Return, which, it is hoped, will be completed in the course of a fortnight.

White Estate, Bantry.

Mr. GILHOOLY (Cork Co., W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain the cause of delay in the sale of the White Estate (near Bantry); and whether he can state approximately when it will be sold.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Report made to the Land Judge in the matter of this estate deals with a very large number of holdings. In the case of many of these, the Land Commission have required amendments to be made in the rental, and this cannot be done without the consent of, or on notice to, the tenants whose interests would be affected It is not possible, at present, to say when the property will be offered to the tenants.

Irish Agricultural Statistics.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the Report of the Agricultural Board (Ireland) for the year ending 31st March, 1902, may be expected before the end of the Session, and if there is any reason for the delay in its publication; if he can state the aggregate amount of the grants made by the Board, in respect of agricultural purposes during the year ending 31st March, to the counties of Armagh, Down, Antrim, and Derry; and also, for like purposes, the aggregate to the province of Connaught, and also the aggregate amounts raised or guaranteed locally in those counties for such purposes, and also in the province of Connaught.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) It is hoped that the Department's Report for the year ended 31st March, 1902, will be ready for issue in the course of next month. The Report for the previous year was issued in the same month. The other information asked for is being prepared, and will be communicated to my hon. friend when received.

Cost of Cavalry and Imperial Yeomanry Outfits.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War can he state the average cost of clothing of a private of Imperial Yeomanry in January, 1900, compared with that of a private of cavalry at the same date.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The value of the South African outfit of a cavalry private in January, 1900, was £7 19s. 2½d., and of an Imperial Yeoman was £9 4s. 5½d.

Remounts Inquiry—Costs.

Mr. PIRIE: To ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the Court of Inquiry into the Remount Department, if he will state what allowance has been made to General Truman for counsel, and what has been that for the assessor appointed by the War Office to assist the Court.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The sum of £660 has been paid to General Truman for counsel, and a further claim is under consideration. The sum of £2,163 has been paid to the assessor.

Case of Private Perry, 12th Lancers.

Mr. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the case of N. Perry, late of the 12th Lancers; whether he is aware that this man was discharged from the Army on the 2nd July, 1896, and underwent an operation on his leg rendered necessary from an accident whilst he was in the 12th Lancers; that, although not allowed to rejoin that regiment, he joined the 34th Middlesex Company of Yeomanry, and went to the war with the 8th Division, but had enteric, and was sent home in October, 1900; that when well again he joined the 21st Sharpshooters, and went again to the front, where he was again injured by an accident in the field; and whether he is not eligible for an allowance as his leg is still bad, in accordance with the recommendations of the recent Committee of both Houses.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) No application for pension has been received from this man; if he will furnish full particulars of the illness and the recent injury mentioned the case will be considered. It appears from his documents that he was discharged from the Middlesex Yeomanry at his own request, and from the Sharpshooters on termination of his engagement.

Army Reservists' Grievances.

SIR CHARLES M'LAREN (Leicestershire, Bosworth): To ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the case, stated by the Secretary of the Army Reservists Fund, of a time-expired man, two of whose children have died of starvation and who is himself in the workhouse, although £40 is due to him for arrears of pay; and to the case of another man, with £30 due to him, who had to pawn his medal to obtain money to support his children; and whether he will, if details of the above cases are brought before him, cause an inquiry into the whole circumstances.

SIR CHARLES M'LAREN: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the statement, made on behalf of the Committee of the Army Reservists Fund, that numbers of time-expired men are still without arrears of pay due to them; that the Secretary of the Committee was not paid for eight months, though he called at the War Office to urge his claims; that the Chairman did not receive any of his pay until eight weeks after his return home with his papers in order, and until he had twice written to the Commander-in-Chief and had a personal interview with Sir Edward Ward; that in this last case £10 only has been paid, and the balance retained until the middle of November; and what explanation he can give of these circumstances.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The statements referred to by the hon. Baronet only reached me this morning. I will have them inquired into. Without wishing to cast any doubt on these particular statements, it is right I should mention that I inquire carefully into every grievance which reaches me and hitherto the great majority have not been borne out by the facts.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

Naval Shipbuilding Programme for 1901.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will inform the House what is the date of commencement of work on the latest ship of the 1901 programme, and when the two battleships and two armoured cruisers of the 1902 programme are to be begun.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The orders for the armoured cruisers for the 1901 programme were despatched on the 29th March last, and letters confirming the telegraphic orders were sent to the contracting firms on the 12th April, when the work was proceeded with immediately. As already explained in the House, the date of commencement of these ships was delayed owing to the necessity for improving their protective armour and modifying their boiler installation. One of the battleships of the 1902 programme has been ordered, and work has been commenced upon her on the Clyde. The second ship will be laid down at Portsmouth dockyard as soon as the "Suffolk" is launched, and it is anticipated that the whole of the money voted for the ship for the current year will be expended on her.

Return of Fleets.

SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will say why, in the Return of Fleets, the order of the ships, and especially in the case of cruisers and destroyers, has been changed from the chronological order previously in most cases adopted, so that easy comparison with former Returns is rendered difficult; and whether the Admiralty will adopt in future an order of ships such as to make reference and comparison more simple.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Return has been re-arranged in the manner explained in the Prefatory Memorandum. Ships of the same class have been grouped together, and it is believed that this arrangement will prove more convenient, and will give more information to hon. Members than that previously adopted. It is proposed to issue any future Return in the same form as that now presented. I ought to add, however, that the Return being furnished for the information of the House of Commons, it is desirable that it should be compiled in such a manner as to meet the views of hon. Members. If, therefore, the right hon. Baronet will submit to me any suggestions with respect to Amendment in the form of the Return I will undertake to submit them to the Department responsible for the compilation, and to ascertain how far they can be incorporated in similar Returns in the future.

Volunteers and the New Musketry Regulations.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, if, before the final approval of any new musketry regulations for the Volunteer force, he will consult with the Council of the Commanding Officers Association as to their details.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I shall be glad to take the opinion of some representative Volunteer Officers before issuing the new regulations which are, however, very elastic. But I should prefer proceeding through the General Officers Commanding Districts and the Advisory Board.

Remount Inquiry.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the Court of Inquiry on the Remount Department, and in view of its being the usual practice that the opinion of the convening officer accompanies the report of such a court, will he state whether such an opinion has been recorded in the present case by the Commander-in-Chief; and, if so, when it will be published; and, if not, will he explain why.

MR. BRODRICK: The opinion of the Commander-in-Chief has been recorded on the report of the Court of Inquiry. He considered the report inconsistent, and therefore unsatisfactory. The remarks of the Commander-in-Chief bear upon the future as well as upon the past, and therefore I do not propose to publish his minute, the future of the Remount Department being still under discussion.

MR. PIRIE: Will the Report eventually be published?

MR. BRODRICK: I cannot make any promise on the subject.

Remount Department.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, in view of the expansion of the duties of the Remount Department, and of the intention in July, 1900, to move the office of that Department to Pall Mall, will he say why the Department is still lodged in Victoria Street, where it is sometimes obliged to wait for four days before being able to obtain War Office papers it may require; and can he explain, in view of these facts, why the Yeomanry Committee was lodged during the war in spacious rooms close to the War Office, and is now occupying more central offices than the Remount Department; and will he state why no administrative increase was made to the headquarters staff of that Department till May, 1900, more than six months after the outbreak of the war.

MR. BRODRICK: The War Office suffers great inconvenience from its work being carried on in a number of different buildings, and various branches, including the Intelligence Department, have with great difficulty and at considerable expense been housed in buildings adjacent to Pall Mall. Repeated efforts were made to obtain more central accommodation for the Remount Department in buildings adjacent to the War Office, but the difficulties of procuring such accommodation on reasonable terms proved insuperable. The Yeomanry Committee had already secured rooms in Cleveland House before the War Office was in treaty for it. As regards the Remount Staff, no increases were asked for until March, 1900, when the Department was required to take over the provision of horses for the Imperial Yeomanry, and the demands by the Inspector General of Remounts for additional staff, in London or in the districts, were in all cases acceded to.

MR. PIRIE: How was it the Yeomanry Committee were able to procure rooms, while the Remount Department could not?

MR. BRODRICK: Because they were already in possession of that particular building.

Cost of South African War.

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state the amount incurred on war expenditure in South Africa to the termination of the war; the amount incurred since that date for transport, terminal charges, and gratuities to the troops; the amount incurred since the termination of the war for military charges other than above; and the amount estimated as required to meet all charges on account of South Africa, other than civil charges, till 31st March next.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): In the absence of final accounts, no better estimate can be framed of the total expenditure incurred in connection with the war than the figures contained in Table I. of the Return moved for by the hon. Member for Poplar in April last (No. 155 of 1902), if the supplementary provision of £17,000,000 in 1902-3, made on the assumption that the war would continue, be omitted.

MR. McCRAE: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will say what amount has been disbursed by the Treasury if he cannot give the actual figures incurred?

*MR. RITCHIE: No, Sir. If I gave these figures it would be misleading. I must wait for the final accounts before I can state what the cost of the war has been.

Customs Arrangements with the South African Colonies.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if, having regard to the expenditure due to the South African War, the fiscal regulations of the new colonies will provide for the preferential treatment of British goods compared to foreign goods.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I anticipate that the South African Colonies will shortly hold a Customs Conference, and it would be premature to make any statement on the subject at the present time.

Repatriation of the Boers.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will say how much of the three million pounds granted for the rebuilding and restocking of the Boer farms at the signing of the terms of peace has been spent up to the present time on the purposes for which it was granted.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am not in a position to say the exact amount, but I have asked Lord Milner to supply a rough estimate, as far as he can do so.

MR. PIRIE: Is the fund being used to pay the expenses of sending the Boer prisoners back to South Africa?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I must ask for notice.

British Policy as to the Mediterranean and the Adriatic.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the policy of maintaining the *status quo* in the Mediterranean, announced by His Majesty's Government to Parliament last session, applies equally to the *status quo* in the Adriatic; and whether His Majesty's Government has received any information of an agreement between France and Italy looking to a contingent disturbance of the *status quo*, and referred to publicly by M. Delcassé; and, if so, whether he will inform Parliament of the nature and effect of the agreement between France and Italy, especially with regard to Trieste and Dalmatia.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): The answer to the first Question is in the affirmative. His Majesty's Government are not aware of any agreement between France and Italy involving a disturbance of the *status quo* in the Mediterranean.

Uganda Railway.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, before a Vote is taken for any further money for the Uganda Railway, he will lay upon the Table a Balance Sheet, showing the capital and the trading profit and loss of this railway, in accordance with the course adopted by directors of railway companies to their shareholders.

LORD CRANBORNE: The Annual Parliamentary Report by the Uganda Railway Committee, which is to be laid in a few days will, I think, be found to contain all the information desired by the hon. Member so far as the circumstances of the line correspond with those of an English railway.

The Operations in Somaliland.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Have the Government any further information as to events in Somaliland?

LORD CRANBORNE: A further telegram from General Manning, relating to the operations in Somaliland, has been communicated to this day's evening papers as follows:—

"Arrived Berbera 10 this morning.

"Swayne has reached Bohotle in safety. Force was not attacked during retirement; situation consequently more satisfactory, but do not cancel orders warning Punjab Regiment from India for service, in case they have been given, as further developments must be awaited.

"Wounded all doing very well; no anxiety concerning wounded officers need be felt. Howard's wound slight, Everett's wound severe (shoulder), but able to ride.

"Aden attachment will arrive today and go forward to posts tomorrow morning."

I may perhaps say in explanation that the Aden attachment, to which reference is made, is about 300 strong, but of course these are not the only reinforcements which the Government have ordered, though we may hope they will not be so much required now. There is a battalion and a half under orders from India—not the Punjab but the Bombay regiment—and besides that we have ordered 600 more African troops from the other protectorates, who are specially useful in Somaliland owing to the local conditions. I need not say that if the news does not continue to be equally satisfactory, if bad news should come, the Government would be prepared to supply even further troops.

North Sea Fisheries Investigation.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in view of the fact that, under the International Scheme for North Sea Fisheries Investigation, this country's share of the joint international expenditure will amount to £42,000, will he state the amount to be expended by the other countries interested.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): My noble friend has asked me to reply to this Question. The only joint international expenditure will be the annual sum of £4,800 for the maintenance of the central organisation at Copenhagen, towards which it is proposed that Great Britain, Germany and Russia should each contribute £1,250 and the other countries £262 10s. The sum of £42,000 represents the amount which will be required by Great Britain to meet our own expenditure during the next three years, inclusive of our contribution to the joint expenditure.

Dingwall and Cromarty Railway.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state what progress has been made with the scheme for a light railway between Dingwall and Cromarty.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: An Order under the Light Railways Act, authorising the construction of the line in question, was confirmed by the Board of Trade on the 1st August last. I have no information as to the steps that may have been taken under the powers so conferred.

Conviction of Metropolitan Policeman for Perjury.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state what sentence has been passed upon the London policeman who was recently convicted of perjury, and what witnesses were examined for the prosecution.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): The sentence passed on ex-Police Constable Rolls is five years penal servitude. The prosecutor was Joseph Wheelerbread, and his evidence was supported by twelve private persons and six police officers.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake that copies of the depositions and a transcript of the shorthand notes of the remarks made by the judge in passing sentence will be forwarded to the Chief Secretary for Ireland?

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): May I ask if the Crown counsel in this case was instructed to state that the aggrieved party——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! Notice should be given of this.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: But it arises directly out of the Question.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The Question on the Paper is what sentence was passed and what witnesses were examined. That has been answered.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): Did the Treasury bear the cost of this policeman's defence?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member must give notice.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the levy made in the different police barracks of London for the defence of the London policeman recently convicted for perjury was approved by the authorities; whether it is a fact that his bailsmen were London police officers; whether the constable was afforded an opportunity of resigning from the force before dismissal; and whether it is intended to award the constable any compassionate allowance from public funds.

*Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS: I have no knowledge of any such levy. The bailsmen for ex-Police Constable Rolls were not police officers. He was not allowed to resign, nor did he ask to do so. His dismissal followed as a matter of course on the result of the trial. A police constable on dismissal forfeits all claim to compassionate or other allowance.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Was the aggrieved person in this case told that it was his duty to bring the police perjurer to justice, and was he obliged to pay his own expenses in doing so?

*Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS: I cannot answer that Question without notice.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Then I give notice of it.

Mr. MACVEAGH: The Question itself asks whether a collection was taken.

*Mr. SPEAKER: And that has been answered.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman give this valuable constable as a present to the Irish Secretary?

Mr. MACVEAGH: Make him a removable magistrate in return for his valuable services.

Crime in London.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether his attention has been directed to the charge of the Recorder at the Central Criminal Court on the 20th inst., and to his remarks respecting the calendar, and the number of prisoners, and the offences; and will he state how many prisoners out of the 116 names on the calendar are charged with murder or attempts to murder; what interval has elapsed since the last sessions; and, in view of the learned Recorder's statement, do the

Government intend to propose legislation of an exceptional character for the metropolitan area.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I have made inquiries on this subject. Seven persons out of a calendar of 116 were charged with murder or attempted murder.

MR. FLYNN: Do I understand that 116 cases occurred since 9th September?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I cannot say when they occurred.

MR. FLYNN: Does not the hon. Gentleman consider that in the circumstances some exceptional legislation such as a Crimes Act is necessary.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Not in England: not in the slightest degree. The sittings of the Central Criminal Court are sufficiently frequent to cope with the business.

Congested Areas in the Western Highlands.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, in view of the creation of new holdings in Barra that took place in the early part of the year, he will take steps to encourage the creation of similar holdings in the Island of Lewis and other congested areas of the Western Highlands; and will he state whether he will arrange to open negotiations with the proprietor of the Island of Lewis and other landlords with a view to the acquisition of the necessary land.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The circumstances now existing in the Island of Lewis are not in all respects parallel to those in the Island of Barra. It does not follow that the experiment tried in the latter island by the Congested Districts Board for ameliorating the condition of the people, and which they hope in course of time will be successful in attaining that object, would be equally suitable to the Island of Lewis. They do not at present think they can usefully open negotiations of the kind suggested by the hon. Member.

International Fishery Conference.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the question of closing areas such as the Moray Firth was brought before the International Fishery Conference which recently met at Copenhagen; and, if so, with what result; and will he say when the Report of the proceedings will be published.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I understand that the question referred to was not formally under discussion at the recent meeting of the International Fishery Council. The question of the publication of the Report is now under consideration.

Rates on Government Hereditaments.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer will he grant a Return of the hereditaments in England, Ireland, and Scotland respectively held by the Crown in respect of which Treasury Bounty in lieu of rates is paid, and the amount in each case; can he say whether the amount of contribution is determined on the principle of what a hypothetical tenant would pay in each case; and, if so, what Treasury Official decides how much the hypothetical tenant would pay in the case of arsenals and dockyards.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HAYES FISHER, Fulham): The preparation of a Return giving each hereditament would be a very laborious matter; but if the hon. Member will move for a Return in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 221 of 1900, I shall be happy to grant it. Treasury contributions in lieu of rates are made as a matter of grace and favour. The valuations are based as far as practicable on the same principles as the valuations of private property. They are fixed in Ireland by the Commissioner of Valuation; in England, Wales, and Scotland by the Treasury, after personal negotiation between the Treasury Valuer and Inspector of Rates and the local rating authorities.

Treasury Contributions for Royal Parks.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will state what amounts respectively have been stopped by the Treasury in England, Ireland, and Scotland, and from what bodies, in respect of contributions in lieu of rates for Royal Parks, and in what year did the deductions begin; is he aware that in the case of the Phœnix Park there is an annual income from grazing, averaging nearly £600 a year, and as the legal test of rateability has been defined to be what a hypothetical tenant would give, can he suggest any reason why the grazing rents of Phœnix Park are not rateable.

Mr. HAYES FISHER: I shall be happy to give the hon. Member privately, or as an answer to an unstarred Question, the details asked for in the first paragraph. The receipts from the Phœnix Park for grazings, etc. (which average £700, not £600, per annum) are more than counterbalanced by the cost of maintaining the Park, which amounts to over £7,000 per annum. In view of the judgments in the case of the Churchwardens of Lambeth *v.* the London County Council, reported in *The Times* of 20th July, 1897, the Treasury would not be justified in making any contributions in respect of them.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: But surely the hon. Gentleman can give me the amount stopped for England, Scotland and Ireland respectively.

Mr. HAYES FISHER: Yes, I have said I will give the information privately or in answer to an unstarred Question. It would be too long an answer to be read in the House.

Mr. John Bright's Statue.

Mr. POWELL-WILLIAMS (Birmingham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the new statue of Mr. Bright has been placed in the position which it is proposed it shall permanently occupy; and, if so, whether he will consider the desirability of removing it to a better position in the outer lobby, such as was occupied by the first statue erected to the memory of the deceased statesman.

Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES (Hunts, Ramsey) (for the First Commissioner of Works): The answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The position was selected with the assent of the donor and the sculptor. With regard to the second part of the Question, the position occupied by the first statue erected to the memory of Mr. Bright has, since its removal, been assigned to the statue of the late Mr. Gladstone, and it is not proposed to alter that arrangement.

Mr. POWELL-WILLIAMS: May I ask my hon. friend whether he will consider the propriety of removing the statue of Earl Granville to a suitable position in another place, and, in that way, of leaving that space available for the statue of Mr. Bright?

Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES: I will make inquiries on behalf of my right hon. friend, but I think the whole matter is under the consideration of the First Commissioner of Works. I will certainly call his attention to the suggestion of my right hon. friend.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the consideration extend to the statue of Cromwell?

(No answer was given.)

London and Paris Telephone Service.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Postmaster General, whether he will state how long the high rate levied for a telephone message between London and Paris,—viz. eight shillings for three minutes time, and sixteen shillings for six minutes consecutive time—has been in existence, and the estimated cost of construction of the telephone between London and Paris, the annual revenue, and the estimated expenditure for the Paris–London telephone.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): The present rate of charge for telephonic communication between London and Paris has been in force since the 1st April 1891. I have no information as to the cost of construction or maintenance of the French section of the line, nor is it possible to separate accurately the cost of working this line from other telegraph expenditure.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON: Does the telephone pay?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, I think it does.

Telephonic Communication with Brussels and Berlin.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether there is telephonic communication between London and Brussels, and London and Berlin; and, if not, whether any steps are being taken to establish direct communication between the cities named.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: A new cable has been laid to Belgium, and telephonic communication between London and Brussels will be opened as soon as the necessary arrangements can be completed. The establishment of communication between London and Berlin is not at present feasible.

Telegraphic Communication with Scotland.

MR. JOHN HOPE (Fife, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he is aware that on Wednesday, 3rd September last, telegraphic communication between England and Scotland was almost entirely suspended, causing inconvenience and loss; and whether, looking to the frequency of such breakdowns in the telegraph wires, will he give some assurance that the underground system will be extended to the principal commercial centres of Scotland.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am aware that telegraphic communication with Scotland was seriously interrupted on the 3rd ultimo, with the result, I regret to say, that the traffic was considerably delayed. I fully recognise the importance of an extension of the underground system, and shall make as much progress with it this year as the funds voted by Parliament for that purpose admit of.

Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment (No. 2) Bill.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he intends to introduce legislation for the better housing of the labouring classes in Ireland during the present session, or will he give facilities for the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for South Louth.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The extent to which the Government is prepared to go in this matter is disclosed by an Amendment which I have put down on the Paper to the Bill of the hon. Member for South Louth.

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: But the right hon. Gentleman promised to introduce a Bill. Will he not keep his promise?

MR. WYNDHAM: I did not promise to bring in a Bill. [VOICES: You did.]

*MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members are not entitled to enter into an argument as to whether the right hon. Gentleman is fulfilling his pledges.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): He never does.

Tipperary and the Labourers Act.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Tipperary No. 1 Rural District Council included in their recent improvement scheme under the Labourers Acts the extension of existing half-acre plots to one acre; and, seeing that the power is vested in the District Councils to grant what is termed the additional half-acre, will he say on what legal grounds the Local Government Board rejected several applications of this nature in connection with this improvement scheme.

MR. WYNDHAM: The scheme proposed the acquisition of the additional allotments to 130 existing cottages. Fifty-one cases were withdrawn by the District Council at the Inquiry. The inspector recommended forty-five and disapproved of thirty-six. These latter were rejected because in some cases the applicants were not agricultural labourers; or were unable to cultivate the land if granted; or because the land was unsuitable; or the applications were not supported by the District Councillors.

Cork Rural District Improvement Scheme.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state why the Improvement Scheme which is being promoted by the Cork Rural District Council has not yet been sanctioned by the Local Government Board, seeing that the District Council has completed all the necessary forms enjoined on them under the Labourers Acts.

MR. WYNDHAM: The scheme is at present the subject of correspondence between the Board and the District Council. It will be sanctioned upon the satisfactory settlement of certain matters at issue.

MR. SHEEHAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman state what are the matters which require adjustment?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have not the information here.

MR. SHEEHAN: Is it not the eviction of a certain number of labourers from their cottages?

Convictions of Irish Councillors under the Crimes Act.

MR. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of county and district councillors convicted in Ireland during the past twelve months, under the provisions of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, and of these how many have been sentenced to terms of imprisonment with hard labour.

MR. WYNDHAM: Thirty-two, of whom sixteen were sentenced by the Court of First Instance to imprisonment with hard labour. In five cases the hard labour was remitted on appeal; and appeals are pending in six other cases.

MR. O'DOWD: May I ask whether the sentence of hard labour does not disqualify these gentlemen from acting on their respective councils for five years?

Mr. Wyndham did not answer.

MR. MACVEAGH: Arising out of the answer is it not the fact that these councillors are disqualified for five years, and was not that the object of the sentences?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is not a proper Question.

MR. DELANY: Will the right hon. Gentleman lay on the table the instructions he has given to the removable magistrates on the subject?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Dingle Harbour.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether an application has been made by the Dingle Harbour Board for a grant, under the provisions of the Marine Works Bill; seeing that the Local Harbour Board is prepared to give £500 contribution, and that the work will benefit a congested district, whether he will take steps to secure that the necessary help will be given.

MR WYNDHAM: The application has been received and will be considered with others. I am not at present in a position to make any further statement in the matter.

Ireland and the Local Taxation Account.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has come to any decision as to the distribution of the balance accumulated from the Local Taxation Account.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have been giving this matter full consideration, but I am not yet in a position to announce a decision.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: When may we expect a decision?

MR. WYNDHAM: When I have had an opportunity of conferring with other Departments concerned.

Dingle Railway and Fenit Pier.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has taken into consideration the burden of taxation which the Dingle Railway and the Fenit Pier are to a congested county; whether he proposes to make a grant for the purpose of carrying out those structural alterations in this railway recommended by the Local Government Board inspector, with a view of making the line financially successful; and whether he will take steps to reduce the charge paid annually on the loan for the construction of Fenit Pier to the rate at which the Treasury can borrow the money.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have considered these questions, in so far as they affect the Irish Government. They are closely related to other questions of a similar character, and can only be decided after a careful consideration of the whole matter in conference with other Departments.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: When will the right hon. Gentleman confer with the other Departments?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am in communication with them already.

Sergeant Sullivan, R.I.C.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what was the amount paid out of public funds with reference to the defence of Sergeant Sullivan at the criminal trial in Sligo; what was the amount paid in his defence in the civil action in Dublin; and will the Government pay Sergeant Sullivan's expenses in any further proceedings that may be taken against him.

MR. WYNDHAM: My right hon. and learned friend has undertaken to reply to this question. [NATIONALIST cries of "Why don't you?" "Where is he?"]

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: This is not a legal question.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member can put the Question again.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I beg to submit to you, Sir, that I am entitled to an answer from the responsible Chief Secretary of the country. This is not in any respect a legal question, but a question of the highest and deepest national policy.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is not an uncommon course for a Minister to ask another Minister to reply, and if he says that he has done so, it is the usual courtesy of the House to await that Minister's answer.

Subsequently, the Attorney General for Ireland being present,

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN said: I beg again to ask this Question of the Chief Secretary, but I must decline to ask such a question of a Castle lawyer.

(No answer was given.)

Arrest of Irish Members—Communications to the Speaker.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any communications, verbal or written, have passed between Dublin Castle and any resident magistrate or magistrates in Ireland on the subject of reporting to Mr. Speaker any prosecution, arrest, detention, or conviction of any Member of this House; and if so, what was the tenour of such communications.

MR. WYNDHAM: In 1888 and 1889 written instructions were issued requesting resident magistrates to notify to Mr. Speaker the fact of the committal to prison of a Member of this House, or his arrest and remand whether on bail or otherwise. Telegraphic instructions were sent in particular cases during the last Session. I have directed that general instructions of similar purport to those of 1888 and 1889 be reissued to resident magistrates.

MR. MACVEAGH: Were any communications made to the resident magistrates after the last discussion in this House? Was Mr. Brown's recent communication to Mr. Speaker a result of communications from Dublin Castle?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have given the hon. Member the facts. I have directed the general instructions to be sent out again.

MR. MACVEAGH: Have they been sent out?

MR. WYNDHAM: I directed them to be sent out three days ago.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: After I raised a debate.

Use of Irish Court Houses for Political Meetings.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he can state if any political meetings are allowed to be held in Court houses in County Down; and whether any instructions have been issued to the Sheriff of that county to disperse such gatherings by force.

MR. WYNDHAM: A general instruction was issued on 1st August to High Sheriffs advising them that—

> "The custody of the County Court Houses is given High Sheriffs for the purpose, mainly and primarily, of providing for the administration of justice, and that, so far as is consistent with that provision, the High Sheriff should allow the County Council to use the Court House for the execution of their duties, but for no other purpose whatever."

It was also pointed out that the High Sheriff, in the discharge of his duty in this connection, is entitled to call for and receive the assistance of the police.

MR. SHEEHAN: Is it not the fact that meetings are being held in Court houses to promote an agitation on the licensing question?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not aware of that.

MR. MACVEAGH: The right hon. Gentleman has not said whether political meetings have been held in Down Court houses.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no knowledge of that. The High Sheriff is responsible for the custody of the Court house.

MR. MACVEAGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire whether meetings of the local Orange Lodge are held regularly in the Court house at Newcastle, County Down?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! If the hon. Member wishes to call attention to a particular case he must give notice.

*MR. DELANY: Who is the authority to decide whether a meeting is political?

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: The removables.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Do the High Sheriffs pay for the maintenance of the Court houses?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Congested Districts in Ireland.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he will grant the Return on the Paper relative to Congested Districts (Ireland) (Population, etc.)

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Martin O'Dwyer.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the case of Mr. Martin O'Dwyer, county councillor since the passing of the Local Government Act, who was sentenced, at a Court constituted under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, to two months imprisonment with hard labour for a speech delivered at Templemore on the 11th September; and seeing that hard labour entails on Mr. O'Dwyer disqualification as a county councillor, and the resident magistrate refused to remit the extra penalty, will he say what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has overlooked the fact that Mr. O'Dwyer has appealed against the sentence imposed upon him by the magistrates. The appeal will be heard at Thurles Quarter Session in January.

MR. SHEEHAN: Is it not a fact that hard labour has been imposed?

MR. CULLINAN: And has not a full meeting of the County Council unanimously condemned the sentence?

(No answer was returned.)

Preaching on the Custom House Steps at Belfast.

MR. DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that the meetings held every Sunday on the Custom House steps at

Belfast lead to riot and disorder, and the statements of Protestant clergymen that they are the direct cause of drunkenness amongst the Protestant working class, instructions will be given to have the Custom House railed in, as in the case of the Dublin Custom House.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The question has been previously considered by me. The expediency of enclosing the steps of the Custom House in Belfast, with the object of prohibiting, or otherwise regulating meetings, is, as I have already stated, very doubtful. The circumstances which led to the enclosure of the steps of the Custom House in Dublin were of a different character.

Mr. DEVLIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that on Sunday last scandalous scenes took place on the Custom House steps of Belfast, and that an old man was knocked down and nearly murdered? I will further ask him whether he is going to allow these riotous scenes, held under the auspices of a so-called religious organization, to continue from Sunday to Sunday.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I cannot discuss the use made of my discretion by way of Question and answer, but if the hon. Gentleman objects to it he can call attention to it in Committee of Supply. I do not know whether the hon. Gentleman thinks it would conduce to good order in Belfast to put up a railing, which, in all probability, would be pulled down, thus increasing the disorder.

*Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): Arising out of the Question, I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will consider the advisability of railing in the Nationalist Benches, for the same reason.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The Question on the Paper was whether the Chief Secretary would consider the advisability of railing in certain steps. He says he has considered it and does not think it advisable. There really is nothing more to be asked on this Question.

Several Nationalist Members rose to ask further Questions.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask hon. Members to remember that there is a limited time for Questions, and there are others which have to be answered. If hon. Members have other Questions to ask which cannot arise directly out of this Question, they must give notice of them in the ordinary way, and let other Members take their turn.

Several Nationalist Members again rose.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask hon. Members to pay attention to my ruling. I assure hon. Members that I have every desire, in proper turn and time, that every Question should be answered. But there are some Questions that ought not to be asked as supplementary, and ought to be put down as fresh Questions, and I think really that this Question has been completely answered. I trust hon. Members will accept that statement. I have stated what I consider to be the rule.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: On a point of order, Sir, I propose to submit a Question arising out of the Question.

*Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN again rose.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I know that hon. Members, in one sense, might ask many questions arising out of the Question on the Paper, but that is not the sense in which the word is used here. A supplementary Question must mean one that is necessary for the complete explanation of the answer actually given, or to supplement an omission in the answer. This Question has been fully answered, and I must ask hon. Members to accept that.

Mr. MACVEAGH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. Gentleman going to submit another Question?

Mr. MACVEAGH: No, Sir, I am not. I propose to ask you whether, when you are satisfied in your own mind that a Question on the Paper has been fully answered, we are to understand that it is not competent for any Member of this House to put a Question arising out of that answer?

*MR. SPEAKER: It is not a Question arising out of the answer in the sense in which those words are used here. If the Question has been fully answered, and the proposed supplementary Question does not arise out of the answer, it must be treated as a new Question.

Sergeant Anderson, R.I.C.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he will state the name of the constable of the Royal Irish Constabulary, at present discharging the duties of his office in the depôt of the Royal Irish Constabulary, Phœnix Park, Dublin, who has given perjured testimony resulting in the conviction of innocent men; and whether he will direct his dismissal from the Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member will find the information for which he asks in the reply given to a question put by the hon. Member for the Ossory Division of Queen's County on 15th July. The reasons for retaining this constable were stated by me in Committee of Supply on July 23rd.†

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: The only answer I will take is "Yes" or "No." Will the right hon. Gentleman instantly dismiss this constable or not?

Mr. Wyndham remaining silent,

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I must make him say "Yes" or "No."

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member to sit down."

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Now, sir—I know the previous answer. The right hon. Gentleman was never asked categorically whether he would dismiss this man or not. If the right hon. Gentleman says he will not dismiss this man, I shall bring the matter to his notice in a very pointed way.

MR. WYNDHAM: I gave my reasons for retaining this man. Those reasons are still convincing to me—and therefore I still retain him.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: He would have got five years in England.

MR. MACVEAGH: And compassionate allowances in Ireland.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: It's an English outrage.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Belfast Police Promotions.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that a Return giving information regarding the number and nature of prosecutions instituted by each candidate of the Royal Irish Constabulary in Belfast for the P (promotion) examination for the past twelve months has been called for by the Commissioner of Police in Belfast; and whether, with a view of preventing a system under which promotion is grounded on the success of prosecutions, directions will be given to the Belfast Commissioner to withdraw this circular.

MR. WYNDHAM: Such a Return was called for. But there is no foundation whatever for the statement that the system of promotion is grounded on the success of prosecutions. This is only one element for consideration in determining a man's fitness for promotion. Other elements are his general qualifications—length of service, the possession of favourable or unfavourable records. As a matter of fact some men were rejected who had instituted a large number of prosecutions, whilst others with only two or three were admitted to the examination.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: But as a matter of fact, was the total number of prosecutions instituted by each man given in the Return?

MR. WYNDHAM: I said so.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: And the *Constabulary Gazette* denounced this system.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxi., 254, 1073.

Irish Presbyterian Church—Position of Moderator of the General Assembly.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is yet in a position to make a statement on the precedence of the moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: No, Sir. The matter is still under consideration.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will you consult the Chief Secretary?

(No answer was returned.)

Irish Railways—Transport of Troops.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War has his attention been called to the accident on the Northern Counties Railway to a train containing a detachment of the 17th Lancers, and to the fact that the squadron left Ballincollig, county Cork, the previous day for Edinburgh, and had travelled to Dublin, and thence *via* Dundalk, Lisburn, and Antrim, by the Great Northern Railway, where they joined the Northern Counties line to go on to Larne; will he say who is responsible for the selection of such a route; will he ascertain how travellers not in His Majesty's service usually proceed from Cork to Edinburgh; and will he state the cost of the transport in question, and the amount of damage caused by the accident, and say whether any efforts are made beforehand to ascertain the comparative costs of transport by alternative routes in such cases.

MR. BRODRICK: My attention has been drawn to this accident. The route described is correct, and the Quartermaster General is responsible for its selection. The comparative cost of transport is considered before routes are made, and such routes necessarily largely depend on the arrangements for reduced rates made with the railway companies. In this case the cost of the transport was about £710, and the cost of transport by the only alternative route would have been over £100 more. The question of the route usually selected by travellers has, therefore, nothing to do with the case. The amount of the damage caused by the railway accident was about £250.

MR. T. M. HEALY: The point has been cut out of my Question. I do not think it out of order to ask why the southern railroads are boycotted and round-about routes on the northern lines selected. Were tenders obtained beforehand?

MR. BRODRICK: The arrangements were made long beforehand, and the whole matter was carefully gone into.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I say it was all guess work.

Irish Parks—Tenders for Bulbs.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether tenders are invited from the Dublin seed houses for the bulbs required by the Irish Board of Works for the people's park (Phœnix Park), Stephen's Green Park, and Leinster Lawn, and are the orders for the same given to the firm sending in the lowest tender; if tenders are not invited, will he say why the practice of the Board to get tenders for all other classes of goods is departed from.

MR. HAYES FISHER: Yes, Sir; tenders are invited from selected Dublin firms, and the Board accept that which is on the whole the most advantageous. In the case of bulbs—which cannot be tested by conformity to a sample—it would be difficult to adopt universally the principle of open competition and the acceptance of the lowest tender, but, in point of fact, the lowest tender was accepted this year.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Do I understand that the firms selected are exclusively Protestant, and that Catholic firms are boycotted?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Irish Affairs—Nationalist Demand for a General Discussion.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether he has noticed the Motion of which I have given notice on behalf of my colleagues, and whether he will now tell us definitely, "Yes," or "No," whether we are to have a day for its discussion?

And I would ask him also kindly to remember that, as this Motion refers to the struggle for the abolition of dual ownership of land in Ireland, on this question we are entitled to speak, not for eighty, but for ninety-five, out of the 103 representatives of Ireland, and for a considerable section of the landlord minority as well.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I will not deal with the question of the section or the proportion of the Irish population for which the hon. Gentleman is entitled to speak; it does not seem to me to have any direct bearing on the principle which I have laid down as having in the past governed the proceedings of this House, and which, I believe, ought to be maintained if its future proceedings are to be of a convenient and orderly character. I have nothing to add to what I said yesterday, but if I am given to understand that the Resolution standing in the hon. Gentleman's name is endorsed and accepted by the Opposition, and will be supported by them as a Vote of Censure, I will give a day for it.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I do not know on what authority the right hon. Gentleman makes any supposition of the kind.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I did not make any supposition.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman said he assumed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No. I said "if I were given to understand." I did not make any assumption or supposition.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Well, who is to give the right hon. Gentleman to understand? (MINISTERIALIST cries of "You.")

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Might I ask the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister whether we are given to understand that he is laying down a new rule in this matter, which is to be the order of the future—that no time is to be given to the Irish Members for discussion unless the subject which they propose to discuss is endorsed by the Leader of the Opposition? and also I desire to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is not well within his recollection that repeatedly, upon the demand of the Irish Members alone, he himself has set apart time for the discussion of Irish affairs?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have laid down no new rule at all. I have expressed what I believe to be the practice. We must really remember that this question of the extension of the Crimes Act has been debated at length in the course of the present session, and that any particular incidents connected with that can in all probability be raised on the adjournment of the House. I am asked as a right to give a day. I do not think I could admit that right without practically violating principles universally accepted.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): With regard to the question of custom, is it not the case in regard to the question of financial relations that a day was asked for and was granted to the Irish Members without consultation with the regular Opposition?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have never denied that.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman kindly answer the question whether it is not a fact that on the question of financial relations and other questions the demand of the Irish Members, and of the Irish Members alone, has been granted? If that is so, why is it only to be granted now if endorsed by the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman must see that the fact that for Irish or any other representatives in this House a day has been set apart to discuss a question has nothing whatever to do with the demand that a day should be given for discussing a question. I shall not grant the demand unless it is made on behalf of the Opposition as a whole, or unless the Opposition as a whole accept and endorse it.

* MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): Is it not the case that last session, at my own sole request, a day was given to me for the discussion of an important Indian question?

* MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): Arising out of the right hon. Gentleman's various replies to the Irish Members, may I ask whether he will give a day for the consideration of the affairs of Timbuctoo?

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: We are entitled to a final answer, Mr. Speaker. Are we to have a day, or is the right hon. Gentleman determined to stick to his policy of sitting on the safety valve?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is not my policy.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, a sa final inquiry, whether we are clearly to understand that when eighty Irish Members ask for a day for the discussion of the affairs of their country the demand is to be refused unless endorsed by the Liberal Party in this House?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Whether they are eighty Irish Members, or eighty Scotch Members, or eighty English Members, it is all the same. It has nothing whatever to do with nationality.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

SERGEANT ANDERSON, R.I.C.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of calling attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, the refusal of the Irish Government to dismiss a constable at the present ime discharging constabulary duties in the depôt of the Royal Irish Constabulary, Phœnix Park, who has by the admission of the Chief Secretary given perjured evidence, resulting in the conviction of innocent men in courts of justice in Ireland, and the danger to the *moral* of the Royal Irish Constabulary and to the personal liberty of the subject involved by the retention of this man's services.

*MR. SPEAKER: I am obliged to examine these questions before I put them to the House. The hon. Member speaks of this as an urgent matter. I understand it is a matter which took place in July last, while the House was sitting, and was then discussed.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: It is going on now.

*MR. SPEAKER: Attention must be brought to these matters at once. The whole object of this Rule is not that something which happened a long time back and has continued since, but that some comparatively recent matter which there has not been an opportunity otherwise of raising, should be made the subject of debate as an urgent public matter. This matter was discussed in the House.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: No, Sir.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: May I point out that it is only today that the Chief Secretary has refused to dismiss this man?

MR. MACVEAGH: At Question time today the Home Secretary announced that an English policeman in the same position got five years penal servitude.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will you allow me to say that to have a man of this kind in the public service is a continuing danger? This day only was the matter brought to actuality. I have read all the debates in reference to it, and in no case has the right hon. Gentleman refused to dismiss this man. On the contrary, he has dismissed two of his confederates. I was amazed at hearing that he was still in the force. I have not sprung this matter on the House, for I communicated with the right hon. Gentleman in regard to it some days ago.

MR. WYNDHAM: On the point of order. On the 15th July, in reply to a Question, I stated that the names asked for were Sergeant Keegan and Constables Anderson and Reid. Anderson remained at the depôt; the others accepted the alternative of resigning. The alternatives were discussed in this House in Committee of Supply two whole days.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I most positively deny that the dismissal was discussed.

*MR. SPEAKER: The matter was brought to the notice of the House by a Question and an Answer which showed that this man was retained in the service of the Crown. That was so far back as the 15th July, and it also appears that there were opportunities for discussing the matter after that date. I do not think that it is one of the things that can be the subject of a Motion of this sort. It cannot be contended that it is an urgent matter.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Fresh incidents alter the case. I would remind the House what took place in the courts of justice in London yesterday, when a sentence of five years penal servitude was passed on a perjured policeman.

*MR. SPEAKER: I cannot allow this to be discussed. What took place in London at another trial cannot affect my judgment. If this were admitted as an urgent matter, then any matter that had happened three months before, and which the House has had an opportunity of discussing, might be brought forward as an urgent matter.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I am amazed at the action of right hon Gentlemen opposite. The First Lord invites us to move the adjournment, and yet we are refused permission. Let me remind you, Sir, that since the discussion nine counties in Ireland have been proclaimed, and the police swearers have been let loose on the people. Let us suppose a constabulary viper were let loose on the House—

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member has addressed himself to the point, and said all that could be said upon it. He is now addressing himself to other matters. I must ask the hon. Member to accept my ruling.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I accept your ruling fully, but I wish to call attention to a Motion made on March 23rd, 1893, when Mr. Dunbar Barton moved the adjournment of the House to call attention to the danger to public peace and the security of property in Ireland caused by the condonation of serious crime by the Executive.

*MR. SPEAKER: I cannot inquire into the history of all these cases. I have stated what my ruling is.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I desire to ask a Question—

*MR. SPEAKER: I have already heard the hon. Member who proposed the Question. He is satisfied that I have given him a patient hearing, and I cannot allow this to go on. There must be order.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: With great respect, Mr. Speaker—

*MR. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the hon. Member to proceed, unless it is on a point of order.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I do rise to a point of order, Sir. I simply desire to put one Question as to your decision.

*MR. SPEAKER: Has the Question reference to a matter on which I have not yet given my decision?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND rose again.

MR. SPEAKER was understood to call on Mr. Brodrick, who accordingly came to the Table.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I wish to assure you, Sir, that my only object is to speak on a point of order.

*MR. SPEAKER: What is the point of order? Has the Question of the hon. Member anything to do with a matter already decided?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: No, Sir, it has no reference to your decision in this matter. I simply, with great respect—[cries of "Name"]—I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it is not my intention to dispute your ruling. I merely rise to a point of order. Surely I may do that.

*MR. SPEAKER: I assure the hon. Member I am as jealous as he can be for the privileges of the House. But the hon. Member must know that it is contrary to order, after I have given a decision, that that decision should be challenged. If the hon. Member were allowed to rise and argue the matter over again, of course that would be contrary to order. If the hon. Member rises to a point of order for the purpose of calling in question my ruling—

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I have not tried to do so.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member assures me that he is not going to question my ruling on the point of order already decided, and that he is going to raise some other point of order, of course I shall hear him.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: My object, Mr. Speaker, in rising to ask the Question was simply to assure myself of what your ruling was. At present, Sir, I do not understand your ruling, and I submit with great respect that I am entitled, respectfully and in an orderly manner, to ask you a Question in explanation of the ruling which you have given, in order that I myself may fully understand what that ruling was. The Question I desire to put is—and this ends the whole matter—do I understand that your ruling is that a Motion, under the Rules of the House, cannot be accepted as urgent raising the question of the action of the Irish Government with regard to an officer, who is admittedly a perjurer?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has hardly acted up to the pledge which he gave.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I think I have.

*MR. SPEAKER: This in my opinion is not a definite matter of urgent importance which can be raised on a Motion of this kind. I have gone to the verge of patience and forbearance. If the hon. Member persists—[the remainder of the sentence was inaudible, in the great uproar on the Irish Benches].

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: This is quite another matter on which we are entitled to be heard.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have decided the matter.

DISTURBANCE AT THE BELFAST CUSTOM HOUSE STEPS—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

MR. DEVLIN, Member for North Kilkenny, rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the riotous proceedings on Sunday last at the Custom House Steps in Belfast, and the neglect and refusal of the Government to take steps to prohibit the holding of such meetings on Government property in that city;" but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. Speaker called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen,

The Motion stood over, under Standing Order, No. 17, until the Evening Sitting, this day.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: If we cannot have a day we will have a night.

NEW BILL.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford), in asking leave to introduce a Bill for establishing reserves of the Militia and Yeomanry, said that Parliament had already accepted the principle of establishing a reserve for the Militia which should not be liable to annual training, but as the law stood, Militiamen could not be exempted from training. The same held good of the Yeomanry. The House had also voted in this year's Estimates a sum for establishing a Special Service Section of the Yeomanry, liable, if they volunteered to do so, to serve abroad with the regular forces in case of mobilisation. Power was taken in this Bill to call out this section. The Bill introduced no new principle, but merely made effective the proposals for which funds had already been voted by Parliament.

Bill to amend the Law relating to the Militia and Yeomanry, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Secretary Brodrick and Lord Stanley.

MILITIA AND YEOMANRY BILL.

"To amend the law relating to the Militia and Yeomanry," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 300.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

(3.30.) MR. ALFRED HUTTON said he would not move the last two lines of the Amendment of which he had given notice. The effect of his proposal was that in case the local education authority could not find any means to carry out the directions they desired in connection with the school in regard to secular education, they should have power to declare the managers at fault, and appoint other managers. The question which arose was, where did the ultimate power lie. The First Lord of the Treasury had put down an Amendment which he supposed was intended to cover this matter, but it seemed very much like the declaration of a pious opinion, and in a great many important matters this Bill contained a recital of a great many pious opinions. This proposal was no novel proceeding. This power was taken out of the Elementary Education Act of 1870, and was now in the hands of the Education Department, and might be used by them in regard to any School Boards in the country refusing to perform their duty. This power had not often been enforced, but the power to put this into force against School Boards, whether large or small, had enabled them to deal satisfactorily with the schools. If the education authority was to have power over these managers, they must have the same power which the Education Department had had in the past. This power was withdrawn from the Education Department by this Bill, and therefore it was doubly important that if the managers failed to carry out the directions of the local education authority, they should be able to replace or suspend the managers of the school. It might be said that, if the local authority proceeded to any such measures, such a proceeding would undenominationalise the school, and interfere with the rights of the managers to control religious instruction in that school. The effect of such a sub-Section would not undenominationalise the school. The First Lord of the Treasury had divided the subject into religious and secular education, but he ventured to assert that there was no sub-Section or words in the Bill which placed any such power in the hands of the managers. Take the trust deed drawn up by the National Society. This deed reserves to the clergyman or his substitute, all the rights to control the religious education, and there was nothing in the Bill to interfere with that under the trust deeds of the National Society. His proposal would not interfere with any rights preserved by trust deeds to control and manage their religious training and denominational teaching. It would not even subject those schools to the Cowper-Temple Clause. He did not see that the First Lord of the Treasury could have any objection to this clear and definite way of allowing the local authority to have this power, and of being able to use it in case of urgent necessity, thereby keeping the managers up to their duties. He moved this Amendment in order to abolish the possibility of friction between the two bodies, for in case there was a struggle between the managers and the local authorities, the body which had the appointment of the teachers was bound to win unless some concession was made of the kind he suggested. His Amendment would once for all give power to enable the education authority to see that the managers who did not carry out their instructions should cease to have the power.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, at end, insert 'and if the managers fail to carry out such directions the local education authority shall have power to declare such managers in default and to appoint new managers.'"—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR ventured to think that the Amendment standing in his name was far better suited for the purpose. He would not discuss it now, but when it was reached on the Paper it would be quite possible to show that his Amendment was not open to the same objections as that proposed by the hon. Member, and it would give the local authority absolute control over all matters of secular education. The proposal of the hon. Member did interfere with the managers who were entrusted with the religious education of the school. The hon. Gentleman's argument was that in the case of some trust deeds the control of religious education was in the hands of the clergyman of the parish. In his opinion one of the great merits of this Bill was that it introduced a large lay element into every question connected with the management of the schools. The managers, as a whole, should be responsible for all that came within the purview of their duties. The Amendment divides them into two sections, to one of which was entrusted a certain class of duties, and to the other a different class. That was not the view of the Government.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he thought the proposal of his hon. friend was in substance very much better than that proposed by the Government. The Government proposed that the local authority should step in and see that this particular matter was carried out. This would be somewhat difficult. In the first place, the local authority might be a long way from the school, and unless they had managers they had no machinery by which this particular matter could be carried out. The simple and only way which he could see in case of dispute, was to give temporary power to put other managers in their place. It would interest him a good deal to see what was the actual practical way in which the right hon. Gentleman proposed that the local education authority should have power to carry out their directions. The Attorney General said the other night that it was easy to find ingenious arguments, but practical difficulties would arise in a considerable number of cases. There would be cases in which the managers and the local authority would come into conflict, and they would have to consider the easiest way of getting over that difficulty. Therefore, he should support the Amendment of his hon. friend as the most practical measure.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said that if the managers refused to carry out the orders of the local education authority, he understood the Prime Minister's intention was the local authority would take over the management of the school.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is going too far. There would have to be a new school built, and the local authority would take over the management soon enough to see their orders carried out.

DR. MACNAMARA took it that the local authority would have power to carry out the direction as if they were the managers. In that event, would this particular school in which the managers refused to carry out the order then become a provided school? If so, under Clause 7 they had power to appoint whatever managers they thought fit. If that was the case, then some Amendment of this kind was necessary. He gathered from what the First Lord had said, that his interpretation was not correct.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the true interpretation was this. If the power given by his Amendment, or by the hon. Gentlemen's Amendment, were exercised, the school would be made what it was now—a voluntary school—but if the managers refused to carry out the directions of the education authority within the sphere of secular education, the local authority would, of course, have the power of refusing to pay for that school, and another school would have to be provided.

DR. MACNAMARA said he understood it would then be within the right of the local authority to strike out the school from any share of the Treasury grant, and to refuse to aid it from the local rate. It seemed to him that that was a considerable power, and that it would meet the whole situation. This was not in the Bill, but they hoped to get it definitely laid down by the Prime Minister's Amendment when they came to it. If hon. Members would look at the Bill they would see that all financial aid was to be received upon the carrying out of the orders of the local authority. If the managers refused to carry out these orders the school would be absolutely without any money whatever. The old Treasury grants were gone, but there was to be a general grant paid to the local authority to be handed over to a particular school on the understanding that the managers carried out the instructions of the local authority with regard to secular instruction. The school, if the managers refused to carry out the instruction, could go on as a private adventure school, but the local authority would have to consider the need of providing proper school accommodation for the district. In that case the school would be a provided school. He thought this Amendment should not be pressed, because it would exclude the discussion of this question when they came to the Prime Minister's Amendment.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said they had great difficulty in discussing this Amendment without knowing what was meant by the Prime Minister's Amendment which would be moved later on. He thought the Rules might be so far suspended as to allow the right hon. Gentleman to give the Committee some indication of what his Amendment meant. The difficulty he felt on reading the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment was as to how it was to be carried out. The Committee did not understand what machinery was to be given to the local authority to enable them to step in and supersede the school managers. If there should be a body of managers so obstinate, dogged, and recalcitrant as to refuse to obey the injunctions of the local authority, surely the remedy of coming in and carrying out these particular directions ought to be an adequate remedy. Owing to the changes made in Clause 7 the Committee unfortunately did not at present know how the foundation managers were to be appointed. He understood his hon. friend's Amendment to provide that if the local authority found the managers obstinately refusing to carry out their directions there would be a new set of managers appointed who would be in accord with the local authority and willing to carry out their directions. If that was his hon. friend's intention, he thought it was a reasonable way of carrying out the object in view. Unless the right hon. Gentleman gave some clearer indication than he had yet given of the way his Amendment was to be worked in order to enable the Committee to judge whether it would be an effective remedy, he would support his hon. friend's Amendment.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said that according to the Bill money was to be granted to a school by the local authority on condition that the managers complied with certain conditions. Under sub-Section 2 there would be a specific remedy in the case of the conditions not being complied with. The managers would have the power to appeal, and the appeal would have to be decided. That meant that the power of imposing the financial condition was not in the hands of the local education authority, but in the hands of the Education Department. It would be found impossible to proceed by *mandamus* against a local authority that refused to carry out the provisions of the Bill, because the procedure was slow and tedious. A *mandamus* could only be got to carry out a particular provision of the Bill. No *mandamus* could be got from the court to carry out the general objects of the Bill. That was the power this Amendment proposed to give. When managers refused to carry out the instructions of the local authority, the only way of dealing with them was to declare them in default. Otherwise there must be delay, and possibly the closing of the school and the leaving of hundreds of children without education at all.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the Government could not accept the Amendment, because it would cut out other Amendments which possibly the Committee would like to see put in the Bill. He suggested with the view of shortening the debate that the present Amendment should be withdrawn, and that the hon. Member for the Morley Division should move it as an Amendment to the plan which he himself would propose later on. That or some equivalent scheme could be adopted, so that the Committee could discuss both plans at the same time.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON accepted the suggestion. and asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*(4.0.) MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said that after the expression of the willingness on the part of the Prime Minister to consider the possibility of really amending some of these regulations, he appealed to the Government, with some little confidence, to assist them in improving the working of the Act by accepting the Amendment standing in his name, which he thought was calculated to secure the better working of the elementary school system. It was generally understood that public elementary schools were conducted week by week throughout the year, except for ordinary holidays, for the purpose of giving a system of ordinary education to the children of all sorts who were compelled to attend. Now, in discussing the relations of the local education authority with the managers, they were face to face with a totally new situation compared with that held in the past. Hence it was that he thought the House ought to consider very carefully how best to strengthen their arrangements, so as to secure entire control on the part of the local authority in the matter of secular instruction. A case arose which illustrated the necessity of, and need for, defining the powers of the local authority and the managers, in regard to the important matter of interfering with the regular course of instruction by closing the school. For instance, in St. Luke's School, in Lancaster, the ordinary work of the school was given up for a week, notice being forwarded in the usual way to His Majesty's Inspector, but the school met, and the efforts of the teaching staff were centred upon the Diocesan syllabus of religious education. It might be asked how that could be done, as it was well known that all religious instruction must be given at the time specified in the time-table. He would remind the Committee that there were regulations that affected the opening and the closing of voluntary schools, and that Article 83 of the Code stated that the school must be opened not less than 400 times in the year, power being left to managers to give holidays — for the purpose of meeting local conditions such as the harvest in agricultural districts. Now, in the official returns of the school to which he referred, the entry was made that the school was closed, and the register was not marked during that week. The children whose parents objected to this religious teaching were not obliged to go; but at the same time, in a voluntary school, attended by children of all denominations, under cover of the provision he had mentioned, the school was so far disbanded in order that the whole attention of the teachers should be given to the teaching of the children in the syllabus adopted by the Diocesan Board, including the Church Catechism. It was to prevent such miscarriages of justice that he contended that the local authority should be supreme in all matters of secular instruction. It was not within the spirit of the elementary system of education that the time of the schools should be broken into for the purpose of centreing on religious and sectarian instruction. He was glad to believe that this was an odd case, but the exceptions proved the rule. If that was done in a populous town, what might be done in a rural parish? In an administrative county like Lancashire, where there were a thousand schools, it was literally impossible for the education authority to deal with each case and itself do all the work thrown upon it by this Clause, but whilst devolving on others the oversight it could control their action. The local authority should be possessed of all power, and only those things left to the managers which were specified in the Bill. He urged the Government in the interests of the good working of a good system of secular instruction throughout the country to accept his Amendment which he now moved.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, after the word 'school' to insert the words 'including the number of days the school must be open during the year.'"
—(*Mr. Helme.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said he could assure the hon. Member for Lancaster that he should not oppose his Amendment if he did not feel that it was unnecessary.

It must be borne in mind that the Code required the school to be opened for a certain number of days in the year, but it would be seen from the words of the Section already passed that the managers of the school were bound to carry out the directions of the education authority as to secular instruction. If the local authority chose to require that the school should be open more than 400 times in the year the managers must obey. With the powers conferred by the Bill on the local authority such a thing as had been mentioned by the hon. Member could never happen if the local authority chose to prevent it. The powers which the hon. Gentleman wished to confer on the local authority were contained in the Bill. Moreover, the Amendment would have a bad effect, for it would limit the general powers the Government wished to confer.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Burghs) said he quite saw the force of the argument of the hon. Gentleman that if they specified certain duties in the Bill they would rather limit the power of the local education authority. But was there not the further danger of limiting the powers of the local authority too much? He was not so sure but that the powers were too generally expressed, and that some of them would be challenged by the managers, if attempted to be enforced; and with some show of reason. He suggested that some of these powers should be set forth in the present Clause or later on in the Schedule. If they were left entirely to general words it would lead to litigation. In other Bills certain specific powers were imposed on the local authority, and then there was a general power vested in them; but here there was not a specific instance of powers which would be a guide to the courts or the Education Department with which it was intended to vest the managers and over which the county authority would have control. The danger was this: that the Prime Minister had had simply the Parliamentary situation in his mind, and he had given instructions to the draftsman of the Bill to compress it as much as possible. Twenty clauses were better than fifty clauses from the point of view of the Leader of the House, who was responsible for getting the Bill through. There was a good deal too much legislation by reference to previous Acts, and to orders and rules of Departments; and was not the Prime Minister carrying that principle too far in this Bill? The Bill had been compressed to such an extent that the moment it was put into water it swelled. All these matters referred to were practical difficulties which each and all of them had encountered in their experience in managing local affairs in County Councils; and he asked the Prime Minister and the Government whether they could not see their way to specify in the schedule a little more the kind of things that would fall upon the county authorities and on the managers? He was sure that if they did so, discussion would be curtailed in the long run. They were having a sort of Bill constructed by cross-examination. It would be better if the Government could see their way to put into a schedule the class of things over which they were to exercise control. Then the right hon. Gentleman could add general words. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that they fixed the salaries of the teachers. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman had got this in his mind but it was not clear in the Act, and if the matter went before a legal tribunal, difficulties would arise in interpreting the Bill. There never had been an Act so productive of litigation as the Employers Liability Bill. He had been told by a judge that with regard to this Act it was purely a toss up whether he gave a verdict for the plaintiff or the defendant. It seemed to him that the Government were sacrificing the efficient working of their Bill in order to save a few days of Parliamentary time. In the interests of the smooth working of the Bill was it not better that the Prime Minister should take into consideration the desirability of giving some indication of the kind of thing which he thought ought to be left to the county authority.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said he entirely agreed with the concluding observations of his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education, and he trusted that the Committee would follow his advice and not the advice given them by the hon. and learned Member opposite. Powers were conferred upon local authorities in this Bill by general words, and in conferring them by general words they could only be cut down by Amendments like this which the Committee were discussing, and if the Committee would refrain from adopting the schedule which the hon. Member opposite had placed before them; and if the Prime Minister would not propose such a schedule or state any specific powers, then the local authority would possess all those general powers which were conferred upon it. But if the Committee embarked upon a schedule of this kind, then the local authority would only have those which were stated in the schedule, or those powers which lawyers called *ejusdem generis*, and they would not have those wide and general powers which he hoped the Committee would agree to.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) said he agreed with the hon. Member for Carnarvon that they might carry these general rules a great deal too far. It would be very hard upon the country that this Bill should become—as it would inevitably become—a measure in which a number of these questions would be litigated throughout. His hon. friend had referred to a very typical example in the Compensation to Workmen Bill. The way that Bill was drawn, and the expense everybody had been put to to bring it into operation, had been a great hardship upon the workpeople. In this Bill they had a very complicated machinery, there were many complicated relations *inter se*, and unless they defined what were their powers to a certain degree—they did not need to go into great detail—to see what were the respective functions of the numerous bodies who would have to administer almost every part of this Bill, they would be sure to raise a number of very difficult questions. He knew that the Attorney-General thought they were not as intelligent as they ought to be in understanding this Bill, and therefore when they raised objections which might arise, he said those were purely the sort of things which never would arise. He did not think that was the case. He understood the Prime Minister to say that he would consider the point which was raised at the end of the discussion yesterday.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The discussion has been taking rather a wide turn, and I would recall it to the exact wording of the Amendment.

(4.25.) MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said these Amendments would be quite unnecessary if they could get some promise from the Prime Minister that he would deal with these details in some general form. If they could have some assurance that some such words as "it shall be the duty of the local authority to issue general instructions to the managers that all matters affecting the secular duties of the managers" would be added, that would cover a great many of the Amendments which were now being introduced. This sub-Section having been defined to a certain extent, there was great danger that many other important matters would not be considered to be in the hands of the local authority in their relation to the managers. He hoped some such general instruction as that which he had suggested would be passed.

MR. M'KENNA contended that it would be better if such words were inserted in the schedule. With reference to the remarks, of the late Vice-President of the Council, to whose opinion he always gave the greatest deference, he regretted that upon this occasion he could not agree with him. He said that if they introduced any words of that sort they would cut down the general powers of the Bill. The words were so general as to be almost useless. The words were general as to the control of secular education, and yet they did not exclude the appointment of teachers for secular instruction. What was a court of law to do in that case? The judges were bound to say that those words had not got the general meaning, otherwise they must have included the appointment of teachers. He hoped that before the Committee stage was over they would insert item after item in the schedule, giving the local education authority control over the education which he submitted they had not got under the Bill as it stood.

*SIR JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington) pointed out that at an earlier stage of the Bill he ventured to move that such a schedule should be inserted, but the Committee refused his proposal. He thought the Secretary to the Board of Education had made a very important statement. He had stated that the words in sub-Section (*a*) carried with them great authority, and were practically supreme. In regard to the extension of hours would the same supreme authority extend to the curriculum?

*MR. HELME said that relying on the assurances which the Secretary to the Board of Education had been kind enough to give, for he had taken down his words "that fixing the number of days for the school to be open is in the power of the local authority, and that managers cannot close the school without consent of the local authority," would be secured by the Government. He now begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHARLES MCARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) said in order that public control might be made fully effective in respect of secular instruction in denominational schools, it would be necessary that certain words should be inserted. In the discussion on the last Amendment, reference was made to the danger of inserting specific words, but he thought there was an equal danger of omitting to insert words where they referred to important matters of principle. He had no doubt it was the intention of the framers of the Bill that the words in sub-Section (*a*) applied not only to the course of instruction, but to the persons by whom the instruction was to be given. But he thought the words were capable of a much narrower interpretation than that. They might be confined to the subject matter of the teaching and the manner in which it was given, and might not extend to the organisation of the teaching staff. One of the objects of this Bill was to place all schools on the same educational level. If that was to be done it was clear that the local authority would have to be armed with full powers to deal with the composition of the teaching staff; they would have to prescribe what number of teachers should be appointed in relation to the number of scholars; whether all the teachers were to be certificated or only some, and what was to be the proportion between the certificated and uncertificated teachers; whether pupil teachers were to be reckoned part of the staff, and the scale of remuneration. As his Amendment was originally drafted, the word "remuneration" was inserted, but he had been assured on high authority that, having regard to the insertion in the Bill of words which gave the local authority complete control over public funds, it would be superfluous for that word to be inserted. At the same time it would have to be understood that the local authority had the power to fix the general scale of teachers' salaries, otherwise it would be open to the managers of one school to be more generous at the public expense than the managers of another school. As to the dismissal of teachers, he thought it was evident that if there was to be public control, the local authority must have the same voice as regarded dismissal as it had regarding the appointment of teachers. If that was not done, the teacher, after having been appointed, would stand in an independent position with reference to the local authority, and would even be able to set the directions of the local authority at defiance. Therefore he submitted that the right of dismissal must be given to the local authority, and indeed the local authority ought to have the power, in case of need, to step over the heads of the managers and dismiss teachers who were proved by the inspector, or on examination, to be entirely inefficient. They had to remember that teachers under this Bill would not be entirely the servants of the local authority. As regarded religious teaching, the local authority would have no control, and, therefore, they ought to define very exactly what extent the control of the local authority was to be. It would not do that because a man was a capable religious teacher, because he might play the organ well, because he sang in the choir, or was an admirable superintendent of the Sunday school, it was to make up for any deficiency in his capacity in secular education. Therefore, he thought it was clear that this power, although it might not be readily exercised, was to be given to the local authority. It was not necessary to go into details. A great deal had to be left to the discretion of the managers. If gentlemen of position were to undertake these duties they could not be mere puppets. At the same time they knew the local authority would have the power to supervise, and, if necessary, correct any action of the managers; and, over and above that, he submitted that it would be necessary to regard this all-important matter, and that distinct intimation should be given to the local authorities that they had a positive duty to deal with these matters, and to lay down lines necessary for the guidance of the managers. Only in this way would they obtain the unity of system they so desired.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, at end, to insert the words 'including any directions with respect to the number and educational qualifications of the teachers to be employed for such instruction, and with respect to the dismissal of any teacher on educational grounds.'" — (*Mr. Charles M'Arthur.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) asked whether the last words of the Amendment would put out of order subsequent Amendments to place the appointment or dismissal of teachers in the hands of the local authorities.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I should think it would affect the question of dismissal. It probably would not affect the question of appointment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he confessed he had some hesitation with respect to the Amendment of his hon. friend; but only on the ground that they ought to be cautious in putting into the sub-Section any words which, while aiming at extending its character, might have precisely the opposite effect of limiting it. However, he was well aware that the Amendment, even if it were not absolutely necessary to make the Bill clear, touched a point of controversy in the country as to the intention of the Government or the effect of the Bill. He would not argue whether the Bill, as originally drawn, carried out the intention of the Government with respect to the teachers. Personally, he thought it did. But there was no doubt that that intention was entirely in conformity with his hon. friend's Amendment. It might be held that the dismissal of teachers was not included in the general phrase about the control of secular education being vested in the local authority; and, therefore, in order to remove that misconception and place the matter beyond doubt, he would accept the Amendment.

MR. M'KENNA said that he wished to move an Amendment to the Amendment. The hon. Member for the Exchange Division had already referred to the desirability of the teachers not being chosen on the ground of their efficiency in playing the organ at church, or leading the choir, or superintending the Sunday School. What he desired to secure was that when the teachers were appointed they should not have these duties put upon them. He thought the local education authority should regulate the duties of the teachers, and that the teachers should have an appeal to the local education authority as against the managers. Unless some words were introduced to govern that there would be no such power in the Bill. He therefore begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the first word 'the,' to insert the words "regulation of the duties and the'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

(4.45.) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs), said the object of the hon. Member was clearly covered by the Bill as it stood, and therefore the Amendment could not be accepted. There was no use in piling up words. The words "with regard to secular instruction" simply meant power to give instructions to the teacher as such.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) thought the Amendment hardly raised the question his hon. friend had in mind. It would be better to raise it at a later stage in a more specific form.

DR. MACNAMARA appealed to his hon. friend not to press the Amendment in its present general form.

The specific questions referred to constituted a serious public scandal, with which both sides would be ready to deal in the proper way at the proper time. A school teacher, when appointed, ought to be at absolute liberty in his own time to do as he pleased, always provided that what he did was not inconsistent with his duty as a public school teacher. He hoped that matter would be raised in a specific form later on, but in the meantime he suggested the Amendment should be withdrawn.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) thought there ought to be in the hands of the local authority power to dismiss a teacher on many other than educational grounds. He suggested the Committee were somewhat out of order in discussing the question on the present Amendment, because if the Amendment were accepted as it stood the teacher would be dismissable only on educational grounds.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the hon. Member was mistaken. It was not the intention that a teacher should be dismissible only on educational grounds, but the proposal was to give the local authority power to require on educational grounds the dismissal of a teacher. He certainly might be dismissed on other grounds.

MR. BRYCE thought the point of his hon. friend was that it might be inferred from the Amendment when they came to sub-Section (*c*) that the local authority would not have power to direct a teacher's dismissal on other than educational grounds. The reference was probably to questions of character, which were questions neither of religious nor of secular instructions.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY instanced the extreme case of a teacher who attended school drunk. That would be misconduct which, on educational grounds, warranted dismissal. Any misconduct which affected his position as a teacher would, he thought, be "educational grounds."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said questions of character might arise which would make it undesirable that a particular man should remain a teacher. But would such a dismissal be on educational grounds? He thought the Amendment might very well stand in the present sub-Section, but it was important to know whether they would be able to move an Amendment of an enlarged character on sub-Section (*c*). Surely they might say there that the appointment and dismissal should rest, not upon religious grounds, but upon any other grounds which the local authority thought sufficient.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) contended that if the Committee accepted the Amendment their liberty of action would be largely curtailed when they came to sub-Section (*c*). The unfortunate teacher would be in the position of having to serve two masters—the local authority and the managers, the former having the right to dismiss him on educational grounds, and the latter on general grounds. It would be much better to leave the question alone until they could deal with it thoroughly. The logical position seemed to be that both appointment and dismissal should be in the hands of the local authority, with a veto, to be exercised only on religious grounds, in the hands of the managers. Probably 95 per cent. of the teaching would concern secular instruction, and yet it was proposed to give the power of dismissing the teacher into the hands of the managers who had the right to deal only with the remaining 5 per cent. of school instruction, while the power of the local authority would be reduced to dismissing the teacher on educational grounds. He hoped the Amendment would not be accepted, so that the judgment of the Committee might be left unfettered.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT asked in what position they would stand on sub-Section (*c*). Would it be open to them then to deal with the larger question?

MR. M'KENNA challenged the Attorney General to say where the managers were given the power to dismiss a teacher at all.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR reminded the hon. Member that on the previous day he had quoted a speech of his as having cleared up that point.

MR. M'KENNA asked where the managers would get power to dismiss a teacher except by inference from this sub-Clause, which they were now asked to accept as a concession. Would the Attorney General point to a Clause which gave the managers power to dismiss a teacher?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I have nothing to add to what the First Lord of the Treasury has said.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that he would require the consent of the local authority to the appointment and dismissal.

* THE CHAIRMAN: I think these two are different points. In this case the dismissal would be by the local education authority who give instructions to the managers; in the other case the dismissal would originate with the managers and would require the consent of the local education authority.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My belief is in accordance with your ruling. Personally I should be disposed to think that the two questions were different.

MR. MOSS (Denbighshire, E.) moved to leave out the last three words of the Amendment "on educational grounds."

*MR. CORRIE GRANT: I have an Amendment, Mr. Chairman, which comes before that. It is after "number" to insert "salaries."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move that the Question be now put.

MR. MOSS, on a point of order, asked if the Closure could be moved after he had moved his Amendment to the Amendment.

* THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, because the Amendment has not been put from the Chair.

(5.6.) Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided: Ayes, 250; Noes, 125. (Division List No. 412).

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson, (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasg'w
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William

Godson,Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon,Maj.Evans-(T’r H’mlts
Gore,Hn.G R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnEldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Sir E W(B’rySEdm’nds
Greene,Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd’x
Hanbury,Rt. Hon.RobertWm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf’rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Heath,James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse,Henry (Somerset, E)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,Jno.(Kent,Faversh’m
Hozier, Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col, W.(Salop
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky,Rt.Hon.WilliamEdw.H
Lee,ArthurH(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter (Bristol,S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Macartney,RtHn.W.GEllison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Killop,James (Stirlingshire)
Middlemore,Jhn.Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner,Rt.Hon.SirFrederickG
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt.Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan,DavidJ(W’lthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton,ArthurH.A.(Deptford
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel,Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col.Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F,
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B (IsleofWight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,HC(North’mb,Tyneside
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Ed. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs).
Stewart,Sir MarkJ.M‘Taggart.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn J.G.(Oxf’dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Earnest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb,Colonel WilliamGeorge
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(T’unton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams,Rt.HnJPowell-(Birm
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,RtHonHerbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt,Rt. Hon. SirWilliam
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. SirArthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.

Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Jones, William (Carn'rvonshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lees, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C.R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds S.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone
and Mr. William M'Arthur

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put accordingly and agreed to.

*(5.22.) SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) moved the insertion of words at the end of line 10, Clause 8, providing that the directions given by the local authority to the managers should be such as not to interfere with reasonable facilities for instruction in religious subjects. He did not anticipate that there would be frequent interference by the local authority with the managers in regard to these facilities, but cases might occur, and probably would occur, especially where passions ran fiercely and where the personal element prevailed. Such interference would not necessarily be designed, it might arise from inadvertence. The National Society had, with great care, framed an agreement for transfer of schools during the hours for secular instruction; but that agreement had caused so much difficulty and friction that the use of it had been abandoned. He thought he was making a just and fair claim on behalf of the trustees and managers of voluntary schools when he asked that there should be some definite declaration on the face of the Act that no direction given by the local authority should interfere with reasonable facilities for instruction in religious subjects.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, at end, to insert the words 'But no such directions shall be such as to interfere with reasonable facilities for instruction in religious subjects.'"—(*Sir Francis Powell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the Amendment appeared to be a reasonable one, and it did not in any way conflict with the powers to be given to the local authority to issue directions in respect of secular instruction. The Amendment would do no more than remind the local authority that the religious instruction given in the denominational schools was an important part of the instruction, and was in fact the *raison d'être* for such schools. On behalf of the Government he was prepared to accept the Amendment.

MR. BRYCE said he was surprised that the hon. Gentleman should think the Amendment necessary to remind local authorities that there were such things as denominational schools. He should have thought that there was no line in the Bill which did not remind them in the most painful way that they were to be "cribbed, cabined, and confined" by denominational managers. He could see no object for the Amendment but one, namely, to suggest a new ground of dispute between the managers and the local authorities. What possible need could there be for declaring that religious instruction was to be safeguarded when the whole function of the managers was to safeguard it? He thought the Amendment ought to be resisted on the ground that it was provocative and likely to cause friction and trouble.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT asked who was to determine whether the facilities were "reasonable" or not.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that would be determined under the powers in sub-Section 2.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he did not know whether sub section 2 existed or not. It had not been passed. If it existed this Amendment was unnecessary. If sub-Section 2 was operative, and if there was a dispute on the question whether there was sufficient time given for religious instruction, it would be referred to the Board of Education. If that was not so, was the question to be determined by a court of law? The Committee should know how the word "reasonable" was to be interpreted and by whom.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said it was a little startling to find the Government accepting this Amendment when during the past three or four days they had been rejecting as mere surplusage Amendments which were proposed for the purpose of making the Bill practical and easy to work. They were asked practically to define what were religious subjects. Surely that was to introduce discord into the practical working of the Act. The managers would be anxious to forward religious instruction, the education authority would be anxious to keep the children up to the mark in their secular education in order to obtain the grants, and there would be endless squabbles about what were "reasonable facilities" for religious education. The members of the education authority were to be generally elected to the County Council for a far different purpose than discussing religious dogmas—practical business-men who would not want to be bothered with these debatable questions. He would gladly have adopted quite a different method of the treatment of this subject, and would have allowed representatives of every denomination to come into the schools and teach their own children their own doctrine.

DR. MACNAMARA said that no one objected to reasonable facilities for religious instruction, but the Amendment did not touch the provided schools. It simply permitted reasonable facilities in the denominational schools, and their case surely was met by Article 4, sub-Section 2, of the Whitehall Code, which provided that religious instruction must be given either at the beginning or at the end of the time-table, or at both, in accordance with the regulations of the Board of Education. What more did they want than that? The Government would be well advised, he thought, to let the matter remain where it was.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the Act of 1870 provided for religious instruction or religious observances at the beginning or end of the school hours subject to certain provisions. All the Amendment provided was that, inasmuch as the local authority had unlimited power of issuing directions, they should not issue directions to such an extent as to occupy the whole of the school hours and so prevent the giving of religious instruction.

DR. MACNAMARA asked whether the local authority would have to obey the Education Code.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that that was so. But they wished to avoid any difficulty by putting it down in express terms that these directions were limited to this extent, that time must be allowed for religious instruction.

DR. MACNAMARA asked whether it was not the fact that the Code provided full facilities for religious instruction.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that that was so.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) thought there was a good deal to be said for not accepting this Amendment, at any rate at the present moment. The Government had laid down, in connection with secular education, that limiting words did not add clearness to what was done, but did add an element of confusion. It was difficult not to apply that argument to this case. He did not feel quite certain that the words suggested by his hon. friend the Member for

Wigan were the best, even if any words were necessary, and he thought this was an opportunity when the Government might have considered the feeling of the Opposition and have postponed the matter, at any rate until the Report stage, for further consideration.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that if everybody in every quarter of the House was opposed to the Amendment it was not worth while fighting about it. The Government had not for a moment suggested that it was of very great importance. It was, he thought, just within the bounds of possibility that they might have an education authority so misguided, or so enthusiastic, about the preponderating demands of secular as compared with religious education, that they might use the great powers given them under this Bill as regarded secular education to squeeze out, at both ends of the school time-table, the element of religious instruction. If that were done, of course gross injustice would be inflicted on the members of the denomination in whose interest the school was established. He thought, however, the possibility of an education authority so abusing its power was extremely remote.

Question put and negatived.

*(5.45.) THE CHAIRMAN: The Amendment in the name of the hon. Member is in the wrong place. We are here laying down conditions of maintenance, and this Amendment advocates clothing the education authority with powers which could not come into the question of maintenance. The next Amendment is possibly surplusage, but at all events should not come into this sub-Section but in a subsequent sub-Section. The next Amendment on the Paper is, I think, already covered.

MR. MCKENNA: I do not move it. I withdraw it.

DR. MACNAMARA said the Amendment which he proposed dealt with a comparatively small matter of school management, and he hoped the Government would accept it. If he could get the assurance of the Prime Minister that this matter would be attended to he would not trouble the Committee further. It was his desire that the control of the school buildings should be left for all purposes with the local authority. At present the school buildings were in the hands of the managers for all purposes, and it was to their interest to see that the schools were kept in a proper condition, but now there was going to be a divided authority, the local authority using the schools for certain hours of the day, and the managers using them at other hours, for other purposes. It was quite likely that the managers might use the schools for parochial teas and parochial and general meetings, and it was quite right that they should; but they might not feel now as they did in the past, and there was an obligation to put the building into a proper state for the local authority next morning. All he asked was that the denominational managers, who might use the school as they pleased in their own time, should leave it in such a state of order that the education authority, when they came in the morning, could get at once to work.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'and shall, on all occasions when the school premises have been used for purposes over which the local education authority has no control, see that the school premises are immediately re-adapted to the educational purposes for which the local education authority requires them.'"—[*Dr. Macnamara.*]

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR was not certain whether the Amendment was not out of order, but it was inconveniently drafted. If however the hon. Member would consult with him upon the words to be used and move the Amendment as a subhead, he did not think there would be any difficulty in the matter.

DR. MACNAMARA gladly accepted the suggestion, and begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I am doubtful about the next Amendment, but I think it ought to come as a schedule to sub-Clause (*b*); sub-Clause (*a*) deals with secular instruction, and this Amendment deals rather more with management than with education.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire) submitted, with respect, that the question had been raised on the previous day, and the first Lord of the Treasury had promised to deal with the matter on the schedule of the Bill relevant to this section. That being so, his Amendment was purely a drafting Amendment, and he submitted that this was the only place in which it could go in.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member has rather stated himself out of court. He has referred to a schedule which does not exist. He might move his Amendment later as a sub-Clause. The next Amendment ought to come into the interpretation Clause, and then we go back to the first Amendment on the Paper.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said in moving this Amendment he only wished to say he did not think the Amendment of the Prime Minister was one which it was possible for the education authority to carry out; because although it gave the power to the county authorities, it gave no machinery to enforce the will of the county authority, therefore it had no value. He urged that some concession must be made to enable the county authority to have some machinery to carry out the object under this sub-Section. He admitted that if the managers of a denominational school refused to carry out the instructions of the local authority, that authority could withhold the grant, and if the school was closed they must build another school to supply the want. This, however, was not a course which the local authority was likely to pursue, though probably they would prefer to provide a public school instead of a denominational school. If that was the alternative which the right hon. Gentleman would prefer he would have no objection to it, but this Bill said something quite different. It said the county authority should continue to provide the denominational school, and it would be remembered that if they built a provided school they would have to do so out of the local parish rates. His Amendment, therefore, suggested the less drastic method of providing for the denominational school instead of having recourse to the building of a provided school. He submitted that his proposal was moderate, and far more practical than this suggested alternative, because the power of suspending the denominational managers would not interfere with the denominational teaching in the schools. The power of being able to use a threat would probably be sufficient to secure the carying out of the will of the authority.

Amendment proposed—

"After the last Amendment, to insert the words 'and if the managers fail to carry out such directions, the local education authority shall have power to declare such managers in default and to appoint new managers.'"—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY agreed that it was desirable the local education authority should have some power, in case the managers failed to carry out any direction which the local authority had power to give, which was less drastic than that of withdrawing the support of the schools. It was desirable that there should be some power less heroic than that, because a power so severe was not one that might be applied, but he did not think that the proposal of the hon. Member was in its precise form that which the Committee ought to accept. It would be much better to confer on the local education authority power themselves to do the act. He submitted that an Amendment which stood in the name of the Prime Minister on a later page of the Amendments proceeded on the lines which he had indicated. [This Amendment provided that where the managers of a school fail to carry out any direction of the local education authority, that authority shall have the power themselves to carry out the direction in question as if they were the managers.] The Government would be prepared to move that Amendment, and he trusted that the hon. Gentleman would see his way to accept it.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he thought it would be desirable if the First Lord of the Treasury could give some idea as to the method and the meaning of the local authority carrying out the directions. The phrase surely meant that the existing Members were to be removed or disabled from acting in some way. Who was to step in and do this? How was the power to be exercised? He thought that the Amendment of his hon. friend suggesting the appointment of new managers was a better solution.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY thought that, if for one reason or another the managers had not complied with the direction of the local education authority, it would occasion great difficulty if the only remedy short of totally stopping the maintenance of the school was that of removing the managers altogether. If they removed the foundation managers and appointed other managers, the foundation managers would disappear altogether; and the effect of the Amendment would be to appoint permanently new managers by the local education authority. This was providing a remedy which was so heroic that it would be open to the objection advanced against the only other remedy suggested of withdrawing the maintenance from the school. The proper line of action with regard to the particular thing which ought to be done was that the local education authority should have the power to step in and do that thing. The work should be done by a person appropriately chosen for the purpose.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) pointed that under the Act of 1870, at any rate in certain cases, the education authority had particular authority for particular actions. The County Council issued an order to the local authority to do a particular thing; if the order was not obeyed within a specified time the Council stepped in, and, through their surveyor, completed the matter at the cost of the rural authority, whom they then reinstated in full possession. As the Attorney-General had pointed out, they had to appoint an agent in all such cases. He therefore suggested that at the end of the Amendment or elsewhere there should be added some such words as, "and to appoint an officer or agent for that purpose." That would remove all doubt and indicate a way by which this valuable addition could easily be carried into effect.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said that what his noble friend had stated was perfectly feasible when dealing with bricks or mortar or roads, but in the present matter they were dealing with instructions, and the same procedure was not applicable. If a recalcitrant body of managers would not carry out the directions as to secular instruction, there was no course open except to appoint other managers who would carry out those directions. The stronger the remedy, the more likely were they to get obedience. If voluntary managers knew that in the event of their being recalcitrant they would be displaced altogether, they were not likely to be recalcitrant.

*(6.18.) MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) was sorry the Prime Minister had accepted the Amendment at this particular stage. He understood that the Amendment the right hon. Gentleman himself placed on the Paper would be applicable to sub-Sections (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), and (*d*), and, in his judgment, it would be far more desirable in connection with (*b*), (*c*), and (*d*) than (*a*). It was almost impossible to conjure up any direction with regard to secular instruction which the local managers would be disposed to resist, but there might easily arise considerable dispute on the other sub-Sections. The intention of the Prime Minister obviously was that the Amendment should be applicable to the whole of the Clause, and he could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman had departed from that intention. Were they to have a repetition of this Amendment on sub-Section (*b*) and another on (*c*)? It was surely not possible that the words now being inserted would refer to that which had already been adopted, and to the sub-Sections that followed. The Amendment ought to remain as the Prime Minister himself had placed it on the Paper, and be applicable to the whole Clause. He agreed there ought to be some remedy less drastic than the entire withdrawal of funds from the school. Such a withdrawal would mean the destruction

of the denominational school, and the substitution of another at the expense of the ratepayers. He, and apparently both sides, desired to avoid that, and to find some means by which managers who would not carry out the instructions could be brought to book, and the school continued without incurring the expense of providing another. He was driven irresistibly to the conclusion that the recalcitrant managers must be replaced by others, and of the two Amendments he certainly preferred the one which enabled the authority to bring into existence another body of managers. If there arose a difficulty so serious as to justify the local authority in stepping in and doing the work itself, what chance was there of amicable relations being established between the two bodies? There would, no doubt, be a long series of irritations, until finally the obdurate managers revolted and refused to carry out the directions. There was the right to go to the Board of Education, but that meant the withdrawal of the grant, and something less than that was wanted. If the managers revolted, how could the school be carried on by sending down an officer, or by giving an order from a central department? His impression was that disputes were more likely to arise in connection with the appointment or dismissal of the teacher or some structural alteration of the building than in regard to anything else under the Bill. What board of managers would care sufficiently whether history or grammar was taken in the school to deny the right of the local authority to intervene? The control of secular instruction was regulated already by the Board of Education. The local authority would not depart to any considerable extent from the Day School Code, and what departure was made would be immediately accepted by the managers. But suppose friction arose in regard to some other sub-Section. The local authority, by the exercise of the power which it possessed, might secure the admission to the school of a person the managers were indisposed to retain. If they dismissed him there might be another appointment and another dismissal, or the person dismissed might be re-appointed, or a person of the same character appointed. There would be a long series of disputes until the local authority declined to stand it any longer and said, "We must take over the control ourselves." It was not difficult to imagine such conflicts. The Board of Education had already had them with School Boards; there had been correspondence extending over years, threatening letters, inducements, visits of inspectors, and ultimately a resort to the law. The Board of Education in such a case did not send down an official to administer education in the district; it called upon the locality to form another School Board. One five-member board would be replaced by another five-member board, and in the event of another default, the existing law empowered the Board of Education to send down five clerks from Whitehall to entrust them with the duty of administering education in the area, and charge their expenses on the rates of the district. That was a very effective way of carrying out the decisions of the Board. He failed to see how, if the recalcitrant managers were to be retained, there was any chance of a satisfactory working. The managers might possibly be acting altogether contrary to the opinion of the great majority of the people in the district. Why should not the old subscribers or members of the Church with which the school was associated have the chance of substituting four other managers for those who would not carry out the instructions given them? Why should not the local authority have the chance of re-electing its own particular two if they were not among the offenders? The refusal to carry out the instruction would be a refusal of the majority; there might be a minority ready, willing, and anxious to comply. That minority might be retained in office, as was done under the existing law, but the majority who refused to carry out the instructions of the local authority should be cast aside and others put in their place. The present Amendment did not set up any machinery to enable that work to be carried out. It would leave the school suspended somehow, but he did not quite see under whose control. Personally, he would rather make it a provided school at once and for ever than allow the friction to go on, because if a school was to succeed it must have the sympathy and support of the surrounding people. Continued friction alienated that sympathy and support, disturbed the progress of education in the school, and was a source of unalloyed evil. Let it be a provided school or a denominational school—one or the other—but let it be in a state of efficiency and not in a state of divided control, constant dispute, irritation and annoyance, in which, according to his judgment, this Amendment would leave it.

(6.30.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR said there was only one sentence in the remarks of his hon. friend with which he cordially agreed, and that was the sentence in which he said that in all probability there would be no disputes on this subject between the local authorities and the managers, and that the powers given by the Amendment, or by the Amendment of the Government, would hardly ever require to be exercised. But he did not agree with the hon. Member in most of the observations he had made. In the first place, he thought he was wrong in saying that the Amendment ought to apply to (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), and (*d*). He could not understand how his hon. friend could think that it was in consonance with the framework of the Bill that they should give the education authority the entire management of the schools, for that would absolutely destroy the Bill. They could never assent to the appointment by the education authority of the great body of the managers of denominational schools. That was a proposal which was totally unnecessary. His hon. friend asked—How on earth could they continue to work a school in which the general body of the managers were constantly setting themselves up against the control of the education authorities, and in which the education authority had to send someone down to see that their orders were carried out over the heads of the managers? He entirely agreed that if there was to be perpetual quarrelling between the Board of Education and the managers, there was one course which could be taken, and that was to refuse to maintain the provided schools and substitute others. That was the proper thing, and that was the remedy under the Bill. In accordance with the pledge he had given, the Amendment which he proposed to move upon this point was a less drastic measure, and it would provide machinery by which an officer—it might be a member of the managing body or somebody else—should be sent down who would, in the case of a particular decision, override the managers and deal with the situation without destroying the denominational character of the school, or upsetting it as a permanent element in the education of the district. If that was not enough, and if the managers were going to set themselves up to perpetually thwart the education authority, he quite agreed that the proper course for the education authority to pursue was to abolish that voluntary school altogether and substitute for it a provided school. That was the plan of the Government, and he thought it was a proper plan. He accordingly begged to move to amend the Amendment after the word "shall" by inserting the words "in addition to their other powers have power themselves to carry out the direction in question as if they were the managers."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'shall' and insert the words 'in addition to their other powers have the power themselves to carry out the direction in question as if they were the managers.'"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that probably there would be very few disputes with regard to secular instruction, but he thought it would be an advantage to get some definite machinery in the Bill which could be put into operation in order to prevent disputes. He was glad that his hon. friend had moved the Amendment, because it raised distinctly the issue between him and the proposal of the Government. He agreed with the Prime Minister that there would be few disputes with regard to secular instruction, but he thought there would be all the fewer if the managers understood what would happen. He wished to point out the danger of the course which the right hon. Gentleman was taking. The Prime Minister said that if the Managers declined to carry out the provisions of the Bill they could then convert the school into a provided school. That would be very unfair to the locality and to the denomination itself. What would happen if his hon. friend's Amendment were carried? The ultimate result would be the provided school, because if managers were appointed by the county authority they could say: "We will withdraw our school." The managers would take away their school, and then the locality would have to face the contingency of providing another school. Suppose the county authority appointed managers in sympathy with the denomination, as they probably would do? They would not appoint managers who were opposed to the teaching of the denomination, because they knew that the only result of that course would be that the denominational managers would take the school away and cast upon the parish the burden of building another school. Therefore they would endeavour to preserve the denominational character of the school by appointing men of that denomination as managers. All they asked from the Prime Minister was that he should not insist upon the extreme penalty of the law, as there would be no danger to the denominational character of the school because the managers had got the whip hand. Once they made it a provided school, it could never become a denominational school afterwards, and the denomination would suffer to that extent. The parish would suffer because it would impose an additional burden upon it. This was not an Amendment unfair to the denomination, but it was an intermediate course between the extreme sanction and the one which was provided in the Bill. He was very glad to hear the case of the defaulting School Board referred to. The provision proposed now was contained in the Act of 1870, and all they suggested now was that the power which the Education Department had of dealing with defaulting School Boards by superseding them should be given to the local authority with regard to dealing with recalcitrant managers. Why should any privilege be extended to these managers if they declined to do their duties? All they asked for was that the law provided for defaulting School Boards should be equally applied to defaulting managers. The Prime Minister said that the denominational character of the schools was not preserved by this Amendment. The National Society trust deed provided that the religious instruction to be given in the schools, and the entire control and management of that instruction, should be vested in the minister for the time being, or in his absence in the officiating minister. There was nothing in the Act which divested the officiating minister of the control of religious instruction. He wished to know whether the Prime Minister proposed to amend the Bill, so as to give the control of religious instruction to the whole of the managers, and not merely to the officiating minister in the parish.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he believed that was in the Bill now. In his view, the managers were to deal with all subjects, and it was for that reason that the Government had felt it necessary to have the denominational managers.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that while reserving his individual opinion as to the interpretation of the Act, he would accept the Prime Minister's statement that he intended religious instruction to be in the hands of the whole of the managers of the denominational schools, anything in the trust deed to the contrary notwithstanding. He was very glad of that statement. If the Prime Minister insisted that the only method of dealing with defaulting managers was to set up a provided school, what would happen in the interim? The provision of a school took eighteen months or two years. The sanction of the Education Department had to be obtained, plans had to be prepared and approved, and the building had to be erected. He would ask the Attorney General, or the Prime Minister, to say what would happen in the interval.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: What happens now?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he thought this Bill was to improve the present system.

Sir. JOHN GORST: Use temporary buildings.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said several applications were made to the right hon. Gentleman when he was at the Education Board, but it was not easy to obtain sanction to use temporary buildings. His hon. friend's Amendment met the difficulty, because new managers would be put in and the school would be under managers provided by the county authority, and, if necessary, at the end of eighteen months a new school could be set up.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said there was no doubt that a non-provided school had great advantages over a provided school, but a remedy had to be found if the managers obstinately declined to carry out the directions of the local authority. Hon. Members opposite evidently considered that to turn a non-provided school into a provided school was an evil to be avoided if possible. [Cries of "No."] He did not consider that there was much need for any other remedy than the power of the purse, which would bring the most obstinate managers to their senses. He saw no objection to the remedy proposed by his right hon. friend, because if the managers declined to establish the curriculum desired by the education authority they could send down an inspector, who would tell the teachers that the curriculum was to be carried out whatever the view of the managers might be. He saw no difficulty in that, and no objection as regarded principle. He thought the Committee should accept the proposal of the First Lord, because it might be desirable to have a weapon to hold *in terrorem* over the managers which would not produce the evil that Members on both sides wished to avoid—namely, of turning a denominational school into a provided school.

DR. MACNAMARA said he understood that if the managers failed to carry out the directions of the local authority, that authority would then have the right to come in and carry out the directions themselves. The hon. Member for East Somerset said that was a perfectly workable plan. He thought it was hopelessly impossible. The managers might be bitterly opposed to something the local authority desired to do. If the local authority came in from the county centre and executed the order over their heads they would still be bitterly opposed to it, but they would still go on in the capacity of managers. He could not imagine anything that would lead to more squabbling and quarrelling in the conduct of the schools. His hon friend's Amendment was far more practicable, because it swept the managers right away. If the managers did not obey the reasonable direction of the education authority, with a reasonable right of appeal, he would give the education authority power to sweep the school away and to establish a provided school. He thought that was what it would have to come to, and he was not afraid of the cost.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said that if a new and distinct school were provided where the managers of an existing school refused to obey the directions of the local authority, it must be a school provided at the cost of the ratepayers. It seemed to him that under this new scheme the trustees of the school came under a statutory obligation to obey the instructions of the education authority, and if they persisted in refusing to conform to that obligation why should they not declare that the existing school was a provided school? That could be done without any cost at all. In former days they were dealing with a private school, and the trustees were told that if they made default a public school would be established. Now these people would be under public obligations, and therefore the education authority were entitled to say that if the managers of the school committed a breach of those obligations they would forfeit their rights, and the school would be treated as a provided school. If they did that they would have a remedy which would be certain to work.

(7.0) MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock) heartily supported the Amendment of the Prime Minister, because while he yielded to no one in desiring to be just to the voluntary schools he declined altogether to protect them in the case of their being recalcitrant. He believed that the Bill provided for a reasonable arrangement, and for conciliatory action between the local authority and the voluntary school managers. He was unable to support the suggestion about withdrawing from the local authority the power of declaring the school that of the local authority in the event of the managers proving recalcitrant. He was surprised at the argument used by the hon. Member for Carnarvon, who seemed to regard with great apprehension the *onus* that would be thrown upon a locality by the suspension of recalcitrant managers of the voluntary schools. That surprised him, because he understood the hon.

Gentleman was the supporter of a system which would have cost the ratepayers of England fifty millions to suppress the voluntary schools. He trusted the Prime Minister would stick to his Amendment. He had every confidence that the local education authority and the managers would work amicably together, but it was due to the local authority that where the managers were not amenable to reasonable orders, the latter should be superseded.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) said that the proposed Amendment seemed to cover the case of a single act of default on the part of the managers. It appeared to him to be unreasonable to remove managers for a single default. The Amendment, however, did not deal with continuous default on the part of the managers, and he wished to make a suggestion to the Prime Minister which would enable them to come to an agreement. It was to add after the word "school," "and if these continue in such default, the education authority should have the power to appoint new managers." These words would apply to continuous defiance and default, but they also meant that the whole of the managers need not necessarily be removed; only those who continuously refused to carry out the directions of the local authority.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he again repeated that he did not think the appointment of other managers was a remedy consistent with the particular character of the denominational schools. It might be a very appropriate system when they were dealing with board schools, but it was not really appropriate to voluntary schools. He could see that the suggestion was made in the interests of harmony, but he could not quite agree with it. The hon. Gentleman seemed to think that the Government plan would not deal with some continuous desire on the part of the managers to thwart the education authority. He did not think that that was so. Supposing that the managers refused to teach anatomy, that the education authority sent down a man, and that the order was given to a particular schoolmaster that anatomy should be taught in such and such hours, on such and such days of the week. Of course, that order stood, and if the teacher refused to carry it out, he would at once be suspended by the education authority. He ventured to make an appeal to the Committee to bring to a conclusion the discussion of this Amendment, which had been thoroughly thrashed out. There was no fundamental division between the two sides of the House as to the object, although he regretted that there was a difference as to the means.

Mr. M'KENNA said that the object of the First Lord of the Treasury appeared to be confined to the point that the local managers to be appointed might alter the character of the schools. But the trust deeds under which these managers were appointed were not altered by this Bill. Any managers to be appointed by the local authority would only be appointed under the provisions of the trust deed. There could not be a doubt on that point. Bearing that in mind, he thought that the Amendment of his hon. friend was superior to that of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. CORRIE GRANT said that they were all agreed with what had been said by the First Lord up to a certain point. The hon. Member for Somerset said that the power of the purse was sufficient; but the exercise of the power of the purse meant the closing of the schools, and that was what they were trying to prevent. He suggested to the First Lord that his Amendment only covered one set of circumstances, while they wanted to cover two. The local authority should have the option to call on the electors of the foundation managers to elect new managers, and if they refused, then to go on to elect some other managers themselves. The other power of which the hon. Member for Somerset spoke might afterwards be brought into action.

*Mr. ERNEST GRAY said that he wanted to repudiate the interpretation which the Prime Minister had put on his former remarks. He did not suggest that the Committee for the voluntary schools should be appointed outside the terms of the trust-deed, but that the Committee should be replaced by four others representing the denominational element.

(7.12.) Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 126; Noes, 249. (Division List No. 413.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hon Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (C'rnarvonshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay, T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. M'Kenna and Mr. Alfred Hutton.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson, King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry

Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn. G R C Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney. Rt Hn. W G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Grah'm (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parker, Sir Gilberrt
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(7.23.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put:"—

Question put, "That the Question 'That those words be there inserted' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 251; Noes, 110. (Division List No. 414.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois Edmund
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest, (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W. (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. G. S. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.

Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir CEH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Essex)
Walrond, Rt. Hon Sir William H
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Col. C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E(Taunt'n
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, Sydney Sproston
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. (Leicester)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M(Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price. Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T(Huddersfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Corrie Grant and Mr. Moss.

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Words, as amended, inserted.

It being after half-past Seven of clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

———

EVENING SITTING.

———

DISTURBANCE ON BELFAST CUSTOM HOUSE STEPS—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

(9.0.) MR. DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.) moved the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance—viz., "the riotous proceedings on Sunday last at the Custom House steps in Belfast, and the neglect and refusal of the Government to take steps to prohibit the holding of such meetings on Government property in that city." In making this Motion he disclaimed any desire to display religious bigotry or Party feeling. He could claim for the Party to which he had the honour to belong that they were guided and inspired by the desire to allay religious passions, and in taking the action he did that night he was animated solely by a desire for the peace and good government of Belfast. On Sunday last a scene of indescribable disorder and tumult took place on the

Custom House steps in Belfast. That House had heard of the Custom House steps before. It was the arena in which the bigots and supporters of the present Government were engaged on Sunday after Sunday in using the most ribald and blasphemous language, not only about the Catholics and the Catholic Church, but against that portion of the Protestant Church whose ritual did not suit their æsthetic tastes. He might mention to the House that the Protestant Association of Belfast had been broken up into two parties—the Sloanites and the Trewites. The Sloanites were represented by the hon. Member for South Belfast, and the Trewites would later on be represented in that House, when Mr. Trew took the place of the hon. Member for North Belfast. There were two leaders in the camp. There was the hon. Member for South Belfast, and there was Mr. A. Trew, and the latter gentleman thought he was entitled to occupy the place now occupied by the hon. Member for South Belfast. The hon. Member for South Belfast, taking advantage of Mr. Trew's absence in one of His Majesty's prisons, entered into the arena, and, in the words of the right hon. Member for North Armagh, "climbed on the back of Mr. Trew into Parliament and then kicked Mr. Trew from under him." The be-all and end-all of the purposes for which the organisation was carried on to the detriment of the public order and peace of the city was the collection. That was at the bottom of the blasphemy and the ribaldry, and again quoting the hon. Member for North Armagh, "the louder the language and the more vituperative the oratory the larger the collections would be." The Chief Secretary, instead of expressing his willingness to take steps to put an end to the scenes of disorder, had in an airy and jaunty manner said the ordinary procedure was adopted, and declined to assent to the railing in of the steps, so that such meetings should be no longer permissible. The Rev. Mr. Peoples, a Protestant clergyman, settled at Ballymacarrett and exercised his legitimate religious functions there, but that did not please the gentlemen who met at Customs House steps; and inspired by the orations of Mr. Trew and Mr. Sloan, at the close of the demonstration the audience filled themselves with drink at the nearest public house, and marched to Mr. Peoples church, broke his windows, and locked him up in his church for nearly three hours. A mob of 5,000 followed him to his lodgings and kept him there two days. The result of it all was Mr. Peoples, who had been engaged in doing good work among the poor of Ballymacarrett, was compelled to leave Belfast, and was now engaged in missionary work in England. He invited the Chief Secretary the next time he attended a Unionist banquet in Belfast to visit Mr. Peoples' church, where every pane of glass was broken, and which remained standing as a monument of the love of civil and religious liberty. Mr. Trew, who had been twelve months in jail for inciting to religious riot, actually stated that during the week he would apply to the Commissioner of police, and the next week he would have a force of men there to keep order. Evidently this gentleman believed that he could get this assistance, because the Government granted him the Customs House steps as a platform from which every Sunday to rouse the passions of a most degraded portion of the community, and turn Belfast into a bear-garden. This pillar of the Unionist Party in Ireland, on a recent Sunday, said that if he had the chance he would make sausages of the Lord Chief Baron if he would come to the Custom House steps. The right hon. Gentleman should be frank and tell the House that South Belfast had frightened him. The hon. Member for South Belfast had been returned against the official candidate of the Tory Party. He threatened that after the next general election he would come back with three other Members to support him; and instead of a Member of the philosophic calm and great experience of the right hon Gentleman the Member for West Belfast, the hon. Member would bring back one of the gentlemen who had added so many choice phrases to their political vocabulary. That was why the right hon. Gentleman was afraid. An honest, courageous Chief Secretary would say, "Let justice be done, though the heavens fall." A man who was not afraid of the rowdyism and the organised power of the forces which returned the hon. Member for South Belfast would say, "Well, if the Irish Members are being hunted throughout the land, if they are being driven out of their own court-houses, we will at least keep up a semblance of impartiality." It used to be said that there were two Irelands—one the Ireland of the South and West, the other the Ireland of the North. Now there were three Irelands in the North—the Trewites, the Sloanites, and the Saundersonites. He trusted it would be an edifying spectacle to see the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh listening to the speeches of the hon. Member for South Belfast. He was not surprised that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary ran away from the Belfast Protestant Association. He was not aware whether the right hon. Gentleman had ever received a military training; he knew that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh had. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman came to Belfast to take part in the South Belfast election, but he could not get a platform on which to open his mouth—not even the Customs House steps. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman stated he would resign the Orange organisation if the hon. Member for South Belfast were returned. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman held very strong views on the war, but he did not go to the war. He had very strong views on the South Belfast election; he went there, and the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman reminded him of lines he had read—

> "The colonel a gallant fighter was,
> In battle most delighting,
> He fled full soon on the 1st o' June,
> And bade the rest keep fighting."

The fight was fought out, and the hon. Member for South Belfast now sat in the House of Commons; there was no railing round the Custom House steps; the scenes of turbulence and disorder which had disgraced Belfast for three years went on; additional factions were fighting out the battle, and disturbing the public weal of the city, and all because the wary Gentleman on the Treasury Bench thought it unwise to finally break away from the rowdies and organised blasphemers who had been the principal factors in maintaining the policy of ascendency in Ireland for centuries.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.) formally seconded the Motion.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Devlin.*)

*(9.35.) MR. SLOAN (Belfast S.) said he had very seldom enjoyed himself so much as he had during the last half hour. If the hon. Gentleman was speaking on what he called an urgent matter of public importance, he himself must be of great importance in the hon. Gentleman's estimation, because he had not touched a little bit of the subject on which he moved the adjournment of the House, namely, the riot which was supposed to have taken place in Belfast last Sunday. The hon. Gentleman's speech was all about Sloanites, Trewities, and collections. But the hon. Gentleman forgot that he was sailing in that boat a great many years longer than he was; and the hon. Gentleman had yet to prove that he (Mr. Sloan) was sailing in that boat now. The hon. Gentleman made some scurrilous remarks about the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh, and his attitude in regard to the recent contest in South Belfast. He thought that when the hon. Gentleman did start his harangue he might at least have confined himself to the particular matter on which he had moved the adjournment; but like his confederate the hon. Member for South Down, when they happened to see the Member for South Belfast out of the House last night, they took the same opportunity to stab him in the back. Conduct like that was becoming from Members on the Nationalist Benches. The demand was that the Government should rail in the Customs House steps. He had been in the habit of going to the Customs House steps for a good number of years, but he had seen more disorderliness and rowdyism in the House of Commons during the past week than he had ever seen on the Customs House steps. There was an old adage "Begin at Jerusalem." He would suggest to the Government, if they were to begin at all, it would be to the credit of the House and to the safety of Members of the Government that they should commence by railing in the Nationalist Benches. If that had been done the probability was that Mr. O'Donnell would not have been suspended. The Member for South Mayo was, however, of very little importance. He wanted

to repudiate some of the magnificent charges made by his hon. friend. He had referred to two leaders. He had not told the House that he was one of them. He referred to a Protestant clergyman repudiating the proceedings at the Custom House steps. He did not tell the House that the same Protestant clergyman repudiated the notorious League with which he had the great honour of identifying himself as the United Irish League. He also suggested that the Government should put a stop to the language which was not pleasant to him, and undoubtedly not acceptable to those who followed him. He did not associate himself with any particular language which had been used at the Custom House steps. He had quite enough to do to be responsible for what his own tongue said. He would like, however, to point out that there had never been any of the individuals who had figured as speakers on the platform at the Custom House steps sent to gaol for boycotting or intimidation, for the simple reason that all loyal subjects of His Majesty King Edward VII. did not believe in that sort of work. They left boycotting to those who were better able to do it, because at the present time, in the estimation of the Nationalist Members, it was the popular thing to go to gaol. It always had the tendency to keep the pot boiling for them, for if the excitement and rowdyism were abated in the House, and there were not a few suspensions during the session, the funds that they looked after would be very small at the end of the year. But they knew how their funds came, and they knew when funds were required, and they came into the House for——.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is developing an argument which is not relevant to the Motion.

*MR. SLOAN said there had been so much talk about collections, so he thought he would have been in order in referring to those of hon. Members. He would have considered it would have been a matter of public importance if the hon. Gentleman had brought up the case of the late John Kensit. They would then have been identifying themselves with popular feeling, and would be working impartially in the interests of humanity and trying to get equal justice all round, independent of creed or doctrine. He had no hesitation in saying, so far as the Custom House steps were concerned, that if the hon. Member the first time he was in Belfast would take a walk round to the place he had invited the Chief Secretary to.

MR. DEVLIN: I was there and saw you there—

*MR. SLOAN said then it was a wonder there was not a riot. If the same spirit animated the hon. Member there which animated him in this House undoubtedly there would have been. However, he just wanted to say on his own behalf that so far as he was personally concerned he had no hesitation in saying that the question now before the House was meant to be an attack upon the Member who had been returned for South Belfast. [AN HON. MEMBER: "We are glad to see you here."] He thought they might be glad to see him out before he went. He repeated that it was quite evident that the attack had been on the Member for South Belfast. [HON. MEMBERS: "No, no."] Well, he repeated that statement, and if it were imagined that any such attack made upon him there would in any way debar him from doing his duty as a loyal subject and a Protestant, those concerned in such an attack were labouring under a great mistake. The coupling of his name with others in the use of language which he deplored as much as any man was not only an injustice to him, but was ungentlemanly on the part of those who made the charges. He trusted that while he was in the House he should at least have an honourable opponent, and would have to listen no more to such scurrilous harangues as the one they had heard that night. There had been a reference to a Mr. Flanagan, whom it was alleged the Irish Chief Secretary was responsible for sending to an asylum. Well, if the Irish Nationalists did not pursue a different course from what he had seen in the House of Commons during the past week, it seemed to him that the Irish Chief Secretary would have to build them an asylum. He advised the hon. Gentlemen on the Irish Benches to try and keep cool since they had had their say. The hon. Member had delivered an amusing harangue. The performance of the gentleman who were sent from the South and West of Ireland [HON. MEMBERS: "And the North."] were undoubtedly an amusing "paragraph" in the scenes of Parliamentary debate, and it would be monotonous, and undoubtedly almost drive them to wonder why they were in this House, if they had not a few of the orators belonging to the United Irish League to entertain them. The rest of the remarks of the hon. Gentleman did not apply to him, and he would content himself by treating the rest of the harangue with the utmost contempt.

(9.50.) THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover) said but for the fact that the Motion was one for the Adjournment of the House on a definite matter of urgent public importance, he should not have thought of intervening in the debate, which everyone had listened to with a considerable amount of satisfaction. There was in that House a pleasant custom of paying a tribute to the first speech an hon. Member made. That was often a mere custom; but he thought he would be carrying the whole House with him when he said that the hon. Gentleman to whom they had just listened, had earned such a tribute for the manly way in which he had made his appearance in that House, and for the self-restraint which he had shown under considerable provocation. But this was a Motion for the Adjournment of the House. That Motion raised two questions—one of fact, and one of policy. The question of fact consisted in the allegation that there was a riot on the Custom House steps at Belfast, last Sunday. There was no riot on the Custom House steps last Sunday. Some time ago an inhabitant of the city of Belfast was sent to prison for one year upon a charge of criminal conspiracy. When the sentence was over, he seemed to think he was thereby qualified and designated to represent an Irish constituency in that House, but the electors of South Belfast took a different view, and they returned the hon. Member to whom they had just listened with such satisfaction. When some minutes back the hon. Member who moved the Motion was descanting upon the effect of what he called the partiality of the Irish Government, he heard the hon. Member for Battersea almost groaning at the iniquities of the Irish Government. Was the hon. Member aware of the fact that Mr. Trew was sent to prison for a year for the crime of criminal conspiracy, and that none of the persons sentenced under the Criminal Law and Procedure Act were, or could be, sentenced to more than six months? [HON. MEMBERS: "Yes; but he was tried by jury."] The question of fact, then consisted in the allegation of riot. What happened was that Mr. Trew, who was not elected to Parliament, although he suffered imprisonment, resented that action, and last Sunday some of those who agreed with him were upon the Custom House steps. He understood there was cheering and groaning, but there was no hissing; no arrests were made by the police; there were no threats to disturb the peace and no threats as to any person's liberty or business or employment, and the matter was one which would have passed unnoticed in this House. As to the question of policy, ought they to rail in the Custom House steps at Belfast? The suggestion was that there had been more than enough of "railing" there already. The view had been advanced that the Custom House steps at Belfast ought to be railed in because those at Dublin were railed in. Well, such little knowledge as he possessed of Ireland had not led him—although he had spent the greater part of seven years in that country—to think that one of the characteristics of the Irish nation was a passion for symmetry. It was best to take the Custom Houses at Dublin and Belfast upon their separate merits. That at Dublin was railed in some years ago to prevent refuse and pieces of paper being left about the building, but there was ample space for meetings to be held outside the railings. At Belfast there were no railings, and he understood that, in order to vindicate the liberty of the subject, and the right of public speech, it was considered by hon. Gentlemen opposite to be the immediate duty of the Irish Government to put railings up. Well, the Irish Government had no intention of doing anything of the kind. His predecessors had stated so in 1899, and he stated it in 1901, and again the other day, and in order to settle this matter of urgent and public importance he would say he was still of the same opinion he expressed two days ago, and twice last year.

*MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) regretted the Chief Secretary had adopted a tone that was absolutely unworthy of the occupant of the office he held. The allegation made was that not riots but riotous conduct had been indulged in, and that allegation was borne out by both the Orange newspapers of Belfast, whose reports of the proceedings were headed, "Riotous scenes at the Custom House steps." The right hon. Gentleman had never given more complete proof of the fact that he knew very little about Ireland than when he stated that the Dublin Custom House steps were railed in because waste-paper was thrown upon them. A more ridiculous statement was never made by a representative man. Those steps were railed in because political meetings were being held there, and repeated protests were made against it being done. The hon. Member for South Belfast, in his entertaining speech, had contended that the Motion was intended as an attack upon him. Nothing was further from the thoughts of the Nationalist Members. They were delighted to see the hon. Member elected for South Belfast, because they recognised in him the first real representative the Orangemen of Ulster had ever had in the House of Commons. There were several Ulster representatives, some of them posing as Orangemen, but the House had never had the real article before. He was afraid, however, that the hon. Member's constituents would be somewhat disappointed at the character of their representative's maiden speech, as they had really believed that the first time the hon. Member got up in the House of Commons it would be to impeach the Pope, or to submit a Motion ordering all the Jesuits in the country to be brought to the Bar of the House. He did, however, sincerely congratulate Mr. Speaker on the speech to which they had just listened, because the hon. Member announced on the Custom House steps in Belfast that if he did not catch the Speaker's eye he would kick up a row, that if he did not get what he wanted he would make himself a nuisance, and that while he did not want to be dragged out of the House of Commons, he would be, if necessary.

*MR. SLOAN: I was not aware that there were so many nuisances in the House when I said that.

*MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Member that this is not a Motion on which to discuss the representation of Belfast.

MR. MACVEAGH said the chief defence for permitting these meetings to continue was that they were of a so-called religious character. The best evidence as to the soundness of that defence would be to read a few extracts from the religious sermons delivered there from Sunday to Sunday. ["Oh!"] Really, hon. Members need not object to hearing a sermon.

*MR. SPEAKER: I would again remind the hon. Member that this is not a general discussion. The Motion refers specifically to the riotous proceedings alleged to have taken place last Sunday, and the failure of the Government to prevent them.

MR. MACVEAGH presumed he would be in order in showing the character of the speeches allowed to be delivered on Government property?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is not the subject-matter of the Motion. The hon. Member must confine himself to the alleged riotous proceedings on Sunday last.

MR. MACVEAGH said he had no desire to transgress the ruling of the Chair. At these meetings Catholic bishops had been referred to as "ribald hypocrites," and "business men in the best paying business in the world," and when such utterances were allowed the Government were going perilously near to provoking scenes of riot in Belfast which would throw into the shade those occurrences which had previously formed the subjects of Royal Commissions of Inquiry. If an end were not put to this state of affairs, he could only express the hope that the Catholics of Belfast would take the matter into their own hands and put a stop to the blackguardism that went on Sunday after Sunday. The hon. Member proceeded to read an extract from one of the speeches delivered.

*Mr. SPEAKER: That does not refer, I understand, to the meeting of last Sunday. I have no doubt that the hon. Member, if he went back over the last ten years, would find an immense amount of bad language had been used in Belfast, but according to the rules of order he must confine himself to last Sunday.

*Mr. MACVEAGH suggested that the police-notetakers, of whom the right hon. Gentleman had a large staff, could not be better employed than in attending at the Custom House steps in Belfast, where incitements to the assassination of the Lord Chief Baron had been delivered. The disturbances of the previous Sunday were between the Trewites and the Sloanites. He did not know what doctrinal or theological differences had produced the dissension in the Protestant ranks, but, according to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Armagh——

Mr. WOLFF (Belfast, E.) asked whether the hon. Member was in order in the line of argument he was pursuing.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is constantly getting away from the alleged riotous proceeding of last Sunday, and endeavouring to enter into a general discussion of the Belfast election and other matters. He really must confine himself to the matter before the House.

*Mr. MACVEAGH said the hon. Member for East Belfast would be acting more courageously if, instead of rising to points of order and endeavouring to limit the discussion, he would get up and frankly identify himself with the blasphemy of these gatherings. He contended that the language used on the previous Sunday in reference to Catholics was so revolting and provocative as to be absolutely dangerous to the peace of the city. There were several ways in which the Government could put an end to the scenes. The first was to rail in the steps. What was the meaning of the Chief Secretary's declaration that that was inexpedient? Simply that mob law was to be allowed to prevail in Belfast as it had always prevailed. It was said that the mob would tear the railings down. Never since the advice "Do not nail his ears to the pump" had a more eloquent exhortation been given to pull the railings down if they were put up. Another way to put an end to the disturbances was to stop the collections which were taken every Sunday. Scenes of disorder from the same cause used to arise in Hyde Park, but the First Commissioner of Works had wisely prohibited the taking of the collections, and the disorder had ceased. That was an example the Chief Secretary would do well to follow, for he would then find that no one would want to preach on the Customs House steps. The attitude of the right hon. Gentleman exhibited not only gross partisanship but great cowardice. All parties in Ireland were absolutely agreed on one point, and that was in condemning the cowardice and general incompetence of the present occupant of the office of Chief Secretary.

(10.15.) Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 188; Noes 121. (Division List No. 415.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor),
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready

Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit William
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R).
Johnstone, Heywood
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesh'm
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B (Cambs.
Malcolm, Ian
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Ropner, Col. Robert
Round, James
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffi'ld
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ambrose, Robert
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael

Kennedy, Patrick James
Labouchere, Henry
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph, (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'ary, Mid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

(10.28.) Question put accordingly.

The House divided:—Ayes, 98; Noes, 200. (Division List No. 416.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cawley, Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jordon, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Patrick James
Labouchere, Henry
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Leamy, Edmund
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'rary Mid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
Tomkinson, James
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds

Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gore, Hn. G R C. Ormsby- (Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W. (B'ry S Edm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn L'rd G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cambs
Malcolm, Ian
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J. (Walthamsto.
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. A. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. J. E B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H C (N'rth'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee:

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.

Clause 8:—

(10.42.) Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 11, to leave out the words 'have power to,' and insert the word 'periodically.'"—(*Mr. Levy.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said he thought the Amendment put on the local education authority a very unnecessary obligation. That authority would be responsible for the maintenance and efficiency of the school. It would find the money, and as a matter of course it would take care that it got the worth of the money by inspecting the school.

Mr. BRYCE said the Amendment did not add anything to the power of the local authority, but he thought it might be worth while considering whether the power should not be made an obligation. They certainly understood from the Government that it was intended that certain functions, hitherto discharged by the Board of Education, should be undertaken in practice by the local authority, which was to relieve the Board of Education of some of its work of inspection. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge to state whether he did not express his views to that effect. Under these circumstances it seemed only natural that the Committee should express its opinion that the local authority should be allowed to exercise its right. Otherwise it was very likely they would take a rather lax view of their duty and would not inspect as much as they ought to do. [Ministerial cries of "Oh, oh."] That was a possibility; they had to guard against possibilities. He could hardly conceive that any harm could be done by accepting this Amendment.

Sir JOHN GORST said there was no doubt whatever that the whole efficiency of the schools depended on a proper system of inspection—a system of inspection by one and not by two authorities. If there were two authorities giving contradictory orders, it was quite impossible that a school could be made efficient. Of all the functions the central authority could perform, that of inspection was the most important. The Board of Education ought to carry out the work of inspection. He quite granted that the present system of inspection was by no means efficient, and he hoped to have the opportunity on another occasion of giving the House his view of what the system should be. It would be a mistake to transfer the work of inspection from the Board of Education to the local authority. To mention only one reason, the Board was capable of having much more impartial inspectors than the local authorities were. No doubt there would have to be a certain amount of administrative inspection by the local authorities, because, as they were to be masters of the finance and to give directions as to the mode in which instruction in the schools was to be carried on, they must have a sufficient amount of inspection to secure obedience to their orders. Of all kinds of inspection the most mischievous and useless was periodic inspection, because under that system the teachers knew when the inspectors were coming. Preparation was made for the inspection, and the inspectors did not see the school in its normal but in its dressed up condition. The inspection should be in the way of surprise visits.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) thought the instructions they gave in this Bill to the local education authority should be definite. The first words of the Clause were that the local authority should maintain and keep efficient those schools, and the fear which some hon. Members entertained was that there was no real intention to enable the local authorities to be the real managers of the schools. The sub-Clauses did not carry out the words with which the Clause opened, and there was no sub-Clause that gave so much support to this condition as the one they were now considering. He thought what the Government meant on the subject of inspection ought to be made clear in the Bill. There should be no doubt left in the minds of those who might have to construe it hereafter. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had said that there ought to be a certain amount of administrative inspection, but that was not provided for in the Bill. There was no desire to interfere with proper inspection through the Board of Education, but the local education authority could not possibly discharge the great duties placed upon it by this Clause unless it inspected the schools and was perfectly conversant with all the work that went on there.

It was absolutely necessary that the Clause should be made clear in regard to administrative inspection.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said the hon. Member for West Islington had used the expression "managers of the schools" in referring to the functions of the local authority. They were not to manage but to control the schools, and these were two very different things. Nothing would be worse for the schools and the ratepayers than to have an unnecessary double inspection. It was quite true that they would want the local authority to inspect the schools occasionally when special points arose, but as a rule he was sure that His Majesty's inspectors would do the work well and efficiently, and if the Committee accepted the new Clause of which he had given notice, namely, that the inspectors should be directed to send their reports to the local authority as well as to the Board of Education, no difficulty would arise. If any difficulty arose then they could no doubt have an inspector down, but they objected to a statutory obligation.

MR. M'KENNA said hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House seemed to forget that this Bill was a measure to establish a single authority which was to co-ordinate primary and secondary education both in the voluntary schools and the public and provided schools. The only official who could serve as a co-ordinating factor between the primary and the secondary schools would be the local inspector. If the local authority did not insist upon inspecting the schools they would have no means of obtaining a uniform standard of elementary education which was to form the groundwork of the secondary department. How were they going to co-ordinate the schools and prevent overlapping, which was the main object of this Bill, unless they had local inspection? It was absolutely essential that they should have a local inspection, but it was obvious they were departing from the original proposals of the Government and coming to the root and foundation of the Bill, the granting of rates for the voluntary schools. They would find, as they went on, the original pretences abandoned.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE said he was sorry that the Government had not seen their way to accept this Amendment. It was certainly one that would make the Bill clearer, and if there was a greater readiness to accept Amendments of this kind they might progress rather more rapidly than they were doing. The right hon. Gentleman had tried to place upon the Amendment before the Committee a sense which it did not quite bear. The word "periodical" did not necessarily mean fixed times. If it did, he might agree with the right hon. Gentleman that there might be a solid objection to the Amendment. He took it that periodical inspection meant from time to time. If the words "from time to time" would recommend the Amendment more to the Government, he would suggest that these words might be substituted. He could not conceive that any self-respecting county authority would not insist upon carrying out inspection of the schools. He wanted to know what was to be the relation between the Government inspector and the county inspector, because that was a matter on which as yet they knew absolutely nothing. Sub-Section 2 provided that the grants in future were to be paid to the local authority and distributed by them to all the schools, whether denominational or provided. That being so, inspection by the distributing authority was absolutely necessary.

*(11.0.) SIR WILLIAM ANSON said they were dealing now with the conditions under which the denominational schools were to be maintained by the local authority, one of those conditions being that the schools should be open to inspection. The education authority would have the right when they pleased to inspect the denominational schools. If hon. Gentlemen on the other side wished to enforce inspection by the local authority by a general rule they must find some other place in the Bill to put it in. This was not the place at which to do it.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said the words "have power to" must be left in, otherwise the local authority would be committing a trespass every time they entered a voluntary school.

Unless they had the right to inspect they had no right to enter the premises at all. The duty of inspecting the schools periodically should be placed on the new education authority, but whether this was the right place in the Bill to impose that duty he was not quite sure.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) said that unless the words "have power to" remained in the Clause the local authority would have no right to enter the school. The arguments of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University were against the Clause and not against the Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman endeavoured to evade the difficulty by suggesting that a certain kind of inspection should take place by the local authority with reference to finance. If that was so there was no force in his objection. If a certain kind of inspection was desirable, why not make it compulsory? They had been constantly told that the Bill was to give the entire control of secular education to the local authority. If that was so the duty of inspection by the local authority was absolute.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said that most Members of the House knew that the School Boards had inspectors who were extremely valuable. Their inspection was not confined to the quality of the teaching. They went into all the details of the school management. He was sure inspection of that kind would be absolutely necessary when the local authority had to deal with education in so wide an area as that of a county. In many cases the managers knew very little of the practical work of teaching, and there an inspectorship was found to be very valuable. From long experience he could say that he had never known a local inspector clash with His Majesty's inspectors.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he earnestly hoped the Committee would not continue the discussion when clearly the Amendment could not be inserted in this place. Hon. Members should recollect what they were at. The question was not the desirability of inspecting this or that class of schools. What was wanted was that it should be made a condition precedent that the local authority should maintain their schools in an efficient state, and it was, if he might say so, verging on nonsense to say that they would not do so. He did not think they would add to their reputation as a business assembly by continuing the discussion.

*MR. FLETCHER MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston) said he could fully assure the First Lord of the Treasury that they appreciated the force of his objection that this was not the place to insert a provision as to the duty of H.M.'s inspectors; but he was anxious that the Committee should not pass from this Clause without an undertaking that inspection should be a duty imposed on the local authority. If the Bill passed in its present form, which only gave a power to inspect, any court would say that inspection was by the Act not contemplated as a duty. What they were afraid of in connection with this Bill was that in regard to non-provided schools there should grow up an idea that the connection of the local education authority with them was not a genuine and business-like connection, and anything which made that *dilettante*, if he might use the phrase, was a thing they were rightly jealous of. They ought to have an assurance that the duty of inspection of all schools, and of auditing the accounts of all schools, should be proclaimed in the Bill.

COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) asked whether it was really to be understood that the new local education authority that was to have control over the secular education of these schools was not to inspect.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he wished to repudiate the interpretation which had been placed on his remarks. They were all in favour of inspection; but his point was that it was bad business to discuss the particular question now raised on a Clause where it would be out of place.

COLONEL PILKINGTON said it was exceedingly difficult for a Member sitting on this side of the House to express his opinion on this question. This was the first time that he had risen during the whole of the proceedings of the Committee, but he desired to follow up the suggestion of the hon. Member for Launceston, and he thought it right to suggest to the Committee that at the proper time it should be recognised that one of the first and most important duties of the local authority should be to inspect the schools regularly, and as often as possible. If they wanted work well done in any affair, whether in schools or in workshops, the most important and valuable thing was for the authority to regulate and inspect that work. He did not suppose that the Prime Minister had a more loyal supporter than he was. He had never voted against him, and did not intend to do so now, but he repeated that, at the proper time, the duty of inspection by the new education authority under this New Education Act should be laid down thoroughly and strongly in the Bill.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that the Prime Minister had complained of the prolongation of the debate, but if he would give the Committee a promise that in some other part of the Bill provision should be made that not only the provided but the non-provided schools should be compulsorily inspected, there would be no desire to discuss the Amendment further.

(11.20.) Question put.

Committee divided:—Ayes, 198; Noes, 88. (Division List, No. 417.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leed.
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christchs
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, John (Kent Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B (Cambs
Malcolm, Ian
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Lieut-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel Wm. George
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones William (Carnarvonshire
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas David Alfred (M'rthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Levy and Mr. Charles Morley.

(11.35.) DR. MACNAMARA said that the proposal to omit salaries was ruled out because the Prime Minister moved the closure; but now having entered on a definition of the appropriation of expenditure, he submitted it was in order to raise the question as to the appropriation of money in respect of salaries

*THE CHAIRMAN: If you have control of the expenditure, you can fix a scale of payment. The next Amendment is, I think, also covered by the words which have been inserted.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said the object of the Amendment he now moved was to make it perfectly clear that any member of the local authority or of the Education

Committee should have the same liberty to enter and inspect any school as the managers. In order to control the schools properly, it was essential that the members of the controlling authority should have perfectly free access to them; and unless it were legally certain that they would have that access under the Bill as it stood, the words ought to be inserted. He hoped the Government would accept a very simple and, he thought, natural Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 12, after the word 'school,' to insert 'any member of that authority, or of the Education Committee, shall have the same liberty to enter and inspect the school as any manager.'"—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he hoped that the hon. Gentleman would not press his Amendment. It was never intended that any individual member of the local education authority should be allowed to roam into a school and inspect it at his own pleasure. The local education authority might make provision for inspection; but would it be contended that it was advisable that every member of that body should have the right of inspection. The Amendment was not one which could possibly be accepted.

MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) said he thought that the Education Committee might at least be allowed to go into the schools, even if the County Council as a whole might not. A similar provision had brought technical education work throughout the country into close sympathy with the County Councils, because members of Technical Education Committees were allowed to inspect the schools from time to time, and the inspection was appreciated by the teachers, and brought the work of education into close harmony with the governing body.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that of course the Education Committee might be useful for the purposes of inspection; but what was not desirable was that it should be laid down in an Act of Parliament that each individual member of the County Council, without any authority from that body, should have the right to enter and inspect a school.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that at present the members of every School Board had that right, however large the Board might be. The fifty-five members of the London School Board could enter any of their schools; but the Attorney-General really exaggerated the practice. He seemed to imagine that seventy or eighty members of the County Council might all wish to enter and inspect a school in a remote part of the county. That suggestion was perfectly ridiculous. The only practical value of the Amendment would be that the County Councillor for a particular district would have the right to enter any school in that district. There was not the slightest danger that a County Councillor would travel from one end of the county to the other in order to inspect a school; but it was desirable that a County Councillor for a district should have the right to inspect the schools in that district. Surely the Government might make that concession.

MR. M'KENNA said that his hon. friend who had just spoken had forgotten one important fact, namely, that these were private schools, and that the only thing public about them was that the public paid for them. Of course the Government would not admit any inspection of the schools. The analogy of the School Boards did not apply; and, therefore, to ask the Government to allow the gentlemen who were elected on the County Council, and who knew all about the schools, or any person, other than a particular official inspector, to inspect the schools, was asking from the Government what they could not reasonably be expected to grant. He trusted, therefore, his hon. friend would not ask them to depart from the great principle of the Bill, which was to maintain the perfect privacy of the voluntary schools, although the public paid for them. He trusted his hon. friend would not press his Amendment.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said he did not quite agree with his hon. friend who had just spoken. He thought that the opposition of the Government was based on a not very wide acquaintance with the facts of the case, and on a mistaken idea that what was desired was to allow the entire County Council to visit the schools in a body. That idea was preposterous. He was sorry to say that in his experience the great difficulty in the past had been not the number eager to inspect the schools but the difficulty of arousing any interest in certain bodies in the work of education. If the doors of the schools were open to the authority charged with maintaining them in an efficient condition, it would be an educational reform of considerable merit. He hoped remarks of his hon. friend would not be taken seriously.

MR. TREVELYAN said he was a member of the London School Board, and what happened had been described by his hon. friend the Member for Carnarvon Boroughs. All the members of the Board had access to the 450 schools which the Board managed. The member for a particular district generally visited the schools in that district, and informed the Board of what was going on. There were a few members on the Board who visited a great many schools in order to get special knowledge — men like Mr. Diggle and Mr. Lyulph Stanley, who were intensely useful to the Board, and whose value to the Board would not be anything like what it was, if they had not constant access to the schools, in order that they might know quite as much about them as the inspectors. That was simply what he desired. He would be perfectly ready to omit "and inspect" from the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said there appeared to be some confusion in the minds of hon. Gentlemen. The hon. Gentleman who had just spoken said that as a member of the London School Board he had a perfect right to enter any school under it; but he imagined that it would be perfectly within the competence of the education authority to do with regard to the schools in its area what the London School Board did with regard to the schools in its area; but no statutory power was given to the members of any School Board for that purpose. The education authority under the Bill as it stood would be perfectly empowered to enter any school in its area, but that was quite different to laying down a statutory provision to the effect that any member of a County Council should enter any school in the county, irrespective of the wishes of the council itself.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said he was glad his hon. friend had limited his Amendment to the right of entry to the schools which the public would be bound to maintain. He would put a practical case, which would show the hardship which would be caused in many districts unless some such Amendment were accepted. Suppose that no power was delegated by the County Council to any particular person to enter the schools, and that there were complaints as to the abuses in a particular school. The County Council need only meet every three months, and it might happen that three months would have to elapse before members of the local education authority could be given the right to enter the schools. Suppose, again, that some abuse was going on in a school with the connivance of the managers; it was only fair that power should be given to the county councillor for the district to enter that school, and he was perfectly certain that in no case would that power be abused.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that the local education authority could give power to their members to enter any school in their area.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said that if it was so the Amendment before the Committee sought to obtain a power which would be within the competence of every County Council to grant. It was necessary to elucidate the matter, because that was not the view of the Attorney General.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said he said exactly what had been said by the First Lord of the Treasury, and he hoped that hon. Members would try to understand him instead of trying to misunderstand him. The authority to enter might either be by actual and express delegation or by the implied course of business.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said he quite followed that point, and was not trying to misunderstand the right hon. Gentleman. But the right hon. Gentleman stated in express terms that they could not be expected to allow the County Council to march into a school in a body; and that, therefore, they should delegate that right to some few persons. That would not meet the practical difficulty, which was that the representative of a particular district on the County Council should not be allowed to enter the schools in that district unless the County Council had empowered all its members to visit all schools in its area. If the County Council had that power it would exercise it. But that was no reason why the Amendment should not be accepted; and he did not think it would be seriously contended that a power of that kind would be abused.

Dr. MACNAMARA said it was desirable that every member of the local education authority, as well as the members of the education committee should have the right of entry into the schools. All the powers and duties of the School Boards were transferred to the new authorities, and it was in the competence of the School Boards at the present time to empower all their members under all circumstances to enter the schools in their areas at any time. He imagined that one of the first acts of the local education authority would be to pass a general resolution giving that power. That being so, he did not see the necessity for the Amendment.

MR. MOSS said that the Attorney General in opposing the Amendment stated that it was surely not to be expected that all the Members of the County Council should be entitled to enter a school at any time; but the Prime Minister on the other hand stated that the Amendment was absurd because the County Councils would have power under the Act to do exactly what was now asked. He thought the Attorney General did not quite realise what the Bill proposed. The Bill proposed that the County Councils should be the local education authority acting through a Committee. A school might be fifty or sixty miles away from the town in which the County Council met, and he agreed with his hon. friend that it might be very important that the member of the County Council representing the particular district in which the school was situated should have the right to inspect that school. He did not know why it should be assumed that the first act of the County Council would be to pass a resolution expressly empowering its members to visit the schools in the county. He thought it was a somewhat remote possibility. He himself thought that if the County Councils were to have the duty cast upon them of carrying out elementary education, they might, at any rate, be given power to enter the schools.

MR. BRYCE said he thought his hon. friend had attained his object, and that it would not be necessary to press his Amendment to a division. The whole difficulty arose from the line taken up by the Attorney General; but what had been said by the Prime Minister removed his objection. It was perfectly true that the powers of the School Boards to be transferred would include that power.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The next Amendment is covered by what has already been inserted in the Bill. The Amendment after that is covered by the right of inspection; which also covers the Amendment of the hon. Member for West Nottingham. The right to inspect a school includes the right to inspect the minutes and other records.

MR. BRYCE said he hoped the Chairman would reserve his decision on that question, because he wished to bring forward a point of order.

Committee report Progress.

To sit again Tomorrow.

AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1.

Committee report Progress.

To sit again Tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 24th October, 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz., Water Provisional Order Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for the abolition of restrictions: from Radnor Park; Keighley; Runcorn; Dalmuir; Cumbernauld; Vale of Leven; Nuneaton; Haswell; Exmouth; Bury; Ebbw Vale; Wrexham; Paignton; and Stanbury; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALE BILL.

Petition against: from Eversholt; Ridgmont; Stogussey; and North Newton; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Keighley; Dalmuir; Cumbernauld; Vale of Leven; Haswell; Walker; Exmouth; Nuneaton; Radnor Park; Ebbw Vale; Wrexham; Stanbury; and Paignton; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Liverpool; Sutton (two); Southampton (three); to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: From Keighley; Runcorn; Dalmuir; Cumbernauld; Bury; Vale of Leven; Haswell; Exmouth; Nuneaton; Radnor Park; Ebbw Vale; Wrexham; Paignton; and Stanbury; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TYPHOID FEVER IN LIMERICK CITY AND PRISON.

Copy presented, of Reports made by Stewart Woodhouse, Esq., M.D., Medical Member of the General Prisons Board for Ireland, and by Sir J. Acheson M'Cullagh, M.D., Medical Inspector to the Local Government Board for Ireland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2908 to 2910 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn until Monday next.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Voluntary Schools Trust Deeds.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will state when the promised copies of the precedents of trust deeds for voluntary schools settled by the Education Department under the Revised Code of 1870 and previous Codes will be laid upon the Table.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I understand that these documents will be laid in a few days' time.

Carriage of Indian Government Goods by German Firms.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he is aware that about 660 tons of Railway material for the Madras railways were shipped from Middlesbrough by the German steamship "Rudesheimer" on 4th July, and about 1,280 tons by the German steamship "Goldenfels" on 25th June; if he can state whether all the locomotives shipped from Middlesbrough for the Madras Railways since 1886 have been carried by German steamships, and whether tenders for this freight have been asked from British shipowners; if not, can he state why this preference has been given by an Indian Government Railway to German firms; and will he take steps to give British steamship owners the opportunity of tendering for such freight in future.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The hon. Member is mistaken in describing the Madras Railway, for which, as stated in the Question, these materials were ordered, as an Indian Government Railway. It is not a State line, but it is the property of a company, by whom arrangements for its working and maintenance are made. The Question would seem, therefore, to have been addressed to me under a misapprehension.

Board of Customs—Grievances of Second Class Examining Officers.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea, District): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the proposals of the Board of Customs for the removal of grievances of the second class examining officers have yet been submitted to the Treasury; and if he can now state when the settlement of the case of these officers may be expected.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) Yes, Sir. The proposals have been placed before the Treasury, who have, with one slight exception, sanctioned them in the form in which they were submitted. The Board expect to be able to communicate the decision to the officers concerned in the course of next week.

Proclaimed Meeting at Rostrevor.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will give the names of the Orange leaders with whom he consulted as to the advisability of proclaiming a meeting to have been held in Rostrevor, on 12th July last.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I accept, as I always have accepted (see *The Parliamentary Debates*, 8th, 10th, and 23rd July) full responsibility on behalf of the Irish Government for the proclamation of the Rostrevor meeting. With that my Ministerial responsibility ends, and I must respectfully submit that it would be contrary to established practice to publish officially the names of unofficial persons with whom Ministers have thought well to consult on account of their experience and influence over important sections of the community.

2nd Seaforth Highlanders.

MR. BIGNOLD (Wick Burghs): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that the 2nd battalion Seaforth Highlanders has only had a station in Scotland for one year in the last twenty-four years, he will consent to the battalion being quartered in Scotland on its return home; and will he say when the 2nd battalion of the Seaforths may be expected to leave South Africa.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) It is not possible to say at present when this battalion will return home, and as the infantry barracks in Scotland will be filled by three other Scotch battalions returning from South Africa by the 26th instant, no barracks will be available for the Seaforth Highlanders. I must point out to my hon. friend that of the twenty-four years referred to, twenty-two have been spent by the battalion on foreign service.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

*(12.8.) THE CHAIRMAN: In reference to the Amendment of the hon. Member for West Nottingham to insert in Clause 8, page 3, line 12, after "school," the words "as well as the minutes or other records of meetings and decisions by the

managers," I must point out that this is covered by the words giving power to inspect.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) pointed out that meetings of managers of schools were seldom held in the school buildings, and the teacher was not always present. He submitted that it was desirable to specify that there should be power to inspect these minutes.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) added that the minutes would, in all probability, be in the custody of a member of the committee who was not an official under the control of the local education authority, and therefore the power to inspect the school would not necessarily imply power to inspect the minutes of the Managing Committee.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said that no doubt in the case of School Boards their power over managers did extend to matters of this kind. But now they were dealing with what had hitherto been private bodies upon which certain public duties were in the future to devolve. It was quite possible they might not consider it their duty to throw the records of their meetings open to inspection, and it was, therefore, desirable to place this right of examination beyond all possibility of doubt.

*THE CHAIRMAN: These possibilities might be indefinitely multiplied. Are you going to give power to inspect furniture and pictures?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think this is one of those things which should be dealt with in the schedule.

MR. BRYCE said that if the right hon. Gentleman would deal with it in the schedule, that would be satisfactory. He was encouraged by what had fallen from the Government on more than one occasion to hope that they would accept this Amendment he now rose to move, because they had repeatedly said that they were very anxious for decentralisation and to relieve the Board of Education of a number of functions it now exercised, but which could well be relegated to the new education authority. Over and over again had the complaint been made that that Board was overburdened, and surely this was a matter which might well be left to the judgment of the local authority. The right hon. Gentleman had expressed himself confident that the new authorities would be jealous in carrying out the Act, and he hoped that confidence would be justified by results. The question whether cases of infraction of the Conscience Clause were frequent, was one on which there might be a difference of opinion, but, undoubtedly, they did occur, and it was desirable to devise some means of dealing with them. The object of the Amendment was to give the local authority power to deal with the question of complaints under what was commonly called the Cowper-Temple Clause. A question of the infraction of the Conscience Clause could not be said in any sense to belong to the sphere of religious instruction. It might be a question of law, of fact, or of both, but it was a question, at any rate, as to whether the provisions of the law had been obeyed. He thought, as he had said before, that such cases would be rare; but the local authority, having its own representative on the body of local managers, would be able to inform itself as to the facts, and there was much to be said for allowing them to have this power. This provision, indeed, appeared to him to be almost the corollary of the right of inspection which had been conceded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 12, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'and to receive, inquire into, and deal with any complaints addressed to them regarding infractions of Section 7 of The Elementary Education Act, 1870.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was in harmony with the right hon. Gentleman in hoping that the infractions of this sub-Section were extremely rare. He believed, indeed, that that was so. But he could not agree with the right hon. Gentleman as to the authority which should adjudicate upon these questions.

He thought the right hon Gentleman would see that his proposal was either impracticable or unfair. One of two things must happen if his Amendment was carried. The first alternative was that there would be two authorities adjudicating on this question of the Conscience Clause, the local authority as regards voluntary schools, and the Education Department as regards provided schools; he thought that would be most inconvenient. Then, if they considered it would be too cumbrous and absurd to have two different bodies both examining into the question of infractions of the Conscience Clause, and abolished the authority which the Education Department now had over provided schools, there would be nobody to adjudicate or take any action if the Conscience Clause was infringed in a provided school. They must, if the Amendment were carried, have one of those alternatives, and as both of them seemed impossible and intolerable, he hoped the proposal would not be pressed.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) suggested that there was still another alternative, and that was, that the county authority should also deal with complaints from the non-provided schools.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I pointed out that the Amendment only allowed two alternatives. I think it would be intolerable to have one authority dealing with the provided schools, and a second authority dealing with the voluntary.

MR. BRYCE: By this Clause we can only deal with the non-provided schools.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: But we must consider the consequences of accepting the Amendment.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought the difficulty was not as great as the right hon. Gentleman imagined. No one suggested that even if the power were given to the county authority that already possessed by the Board of Education would be abrogated. The Education Department must have supreme control over all secular education in the country, and if there was any infraction of the Conscience Clause, whether in provided or non-provided schools, and whether the county authority had the right to examine them or not, the Education Department must necessarily have the same power vested in it. All that was wanted was that the same power should be given to the county authority over the non-provided schools as they must necessarily have over the provided schools. The Amendment, so far from destroying the symmetry of the Bill, would make it more symmetrical. Clause 6 gave the local authority all the powers and duties of a School Board. Now it was part of the duty to examine into complaints of this character. Under this Bill it became not merely the right, but the duty, of the county authority to investigate such complaints from provided schools, and all the Amendment asked was that the authority should be entrusted with a similar power in regard to non-provided schools.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) urged that the power must be in the hands of an authority which could enforce its own decisions in this matter. The power of the Education Department in cases of infractions of the Conscience Clause, consisted in depriving the school of the Parliamentary grant should the managers refuse to comply with their orders. But under this Bill the power of the Department to withdraw the grant ceased, because the financial control was to pass to the local education authority.

*THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) was understood to dissent from this view.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON: Would the local education authority have power to withhold from a particular school a grant, when they were under an obligation to keep that school efficient?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: A school would cease to be a public elementary school if it ceased to qualify for the Parliamentary grant. It would so cease to qualify if it broke the Conscience Clause, and the local education authority would no longer be under an obligation to maintain it.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON: What a cumbrous piece of machinery in order to secure the right of a child to be exempted from religious teaching! The school would cease to be a public elementary school, and presumably the local education authority would have to build a new one to take its place. It would be a much simpler plan to accept the Amendment.

(12.30.) SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) said they must look at this question from a practical point of view. Although he had heard of a great many cases of infraction of the Conscience Clause in denominational schools, he had never heard of a case in a board school. Indeed, it seemed to him almost impossible for such a case to arise in a board school. He personally believed that the deliberate infraction of the Conscience Clause was not a frequent event. It was due either to stupidity or bigotry, or to both causes combined. The man who wilfully violated the Clause was not only a bigot, he was something which he need not mention. But what the Committee had to deal with was the working of the Clause in the small country villages. It had to be a very gross infraction of the Conscience Clause for the Education Department to interfere. He did not know whether the Secretary to the Board of Education would follow the example of his predecessor in this matter, but they were familiar with the form of reply of the Education Department when a case had been stated which aroused the indignation of both sides of the House. "The Education Department have no power to interfere." This was a question of daily work—it was not only the Conscience Clause, but it was also the administration of it, which they had to watch. It was provided that where children at the request of their parents were withdrawn from religious teaching, they should be put in a separate room, and be given secular instruction. But many hon. Members must have heard cases of cruel administration of the Clause, cases of children who were taking the benefit of the Clause being obliged to remain out in the rain or snow during the religious lesson. It was these little things, done by little men in little schools, which created a great deal of the irritation and conflict with which they were now confronted in reference to the present Bill. Hon. Gentlemen opposite and the Government had stated again and again that they recognised that in these single school parishes there was a religious difficulty so far as the Nonconformists were concerned, and that they were prepared to agree to any remedy which would not encroach on the rights of denominational schools; but if they were to be met on these small matters with this absolute *non possumus* on every occasion on account of some theoretical or lawyer's difficulty, he thought they would not be carrying out in the spirit, although they might in the letter, their desire to remove all reasonable Nonconformist grievances. He could not conceive why the Government should not concede this Amendment, for he could not conceive a better or more independent tribunal to inquire into these cases than the county authority. He could not understand the refusal of the Government to give the power to the authority to deal with grievances which were impeding and irritating our local educational systems. If they could not accept this particular Amendment, would they be willing to introduce a better form of words in a more convenient part of the Bill?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said the right hon. Gentleman was perfectly accurate in saying that the Government had recognised that there was a grievance to be dealt with as regards the single school areas, and the Government proposed to do that. But this was a different matter. He thought that these cases of violation of the Conscience Clause were extremely rare, and he ventured to say that they would be impossible when they had a body of managers of voluntary schools such as was constituted under the Bill. He wished, however, to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that the Board of Education had full power to deal with any infraction of the Conscience Clause. The observance of that Clause was a condition of a school's receiving the Parliamentary grant, and if that did not give the Board of Education power to see that the Conscience Clause was enforced, he did not know what could. If the attention of the Board of Education were called to a case of this kind, it would certainly warn the school that the grant would be withdrawn if the objectionable policy were persisted in. He did not believe there would be any want of disposition on the part of the Board to deal with these cases. Whatever Party might be in power, he was sure the Board of Education would fearlessly do its duty in putting an end to any abuses of the Clause. The course proposed under the Amendment would be most inconvenient, for two authorities to decide the same question would be set up. Under the Bill as it stood the county authority would have full power to draw the attention of the Board of Education to infractions of the Conscience Clause.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) said this grievance was eminently a local grievance, and any one who knew the condition of a country district knew that the Conscience Clause, as it was worked at present, was no protection at all. Why should a child who was wrongly dealt with be compelled to go to Whitehall for redress? Why should not the local education authority on the spot have power to deal with it? That education authority was obviously the body to which complaints in this matter ought to be made. He could not conceive what was the objection to allowing the education authority to inquire into breaches, whether they were numerous or rare. It would create a very bad impression if the Government refused to the local education authority the power of giving effect to the Conscience Clause. They said practically that the only person who was to enforce the Conscience Clause was the Secretary to the Education Department. That was virtually the issue put by the Attorney General. The local education authority ought to have the power of enforcing that which was put forward as the only protection of Nonconformists. Was the education authority to have no cognisance or authority in the case of the Conscience Clause, and were they to be compelled to pay the rate when the Conscience Clause was not observed? If ever there was any justification for refusing to pay the rates it would be in such circumstances as those.

Sir JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucester, Tewkesbury) entirely sympathised with the intentions of the Amendment, but pressed the Committee to look at the matter from a practical point of view. No doubt the local authority would exercise this very power under sub-Section (*a*). Whether they could enforce it by legal means was another matter. Anybody who had a complaint to make would inform the County Council, instead of sending the information in a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Education Department. The Council would then interfere, and if they had not full legal rights they could communicate with the Department, who had. Surely that would afford a much more speedy remedy than complaining to Whitehall. He objected very much to encumbering the Act with too many delegations, which tended, in his opinion, to destroy that simplicity of administration which was so eminently desirable.

Mr. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said the hon. Baronet had left the Committee in some doubt as to how he intended to vote.

Sir JOHN DORINGTON: I shall vote with the Government.

Mr. M'KENNA: And yet the hon. Baronet approved of the Amendment. He thought they were all agreed that the means of punishing any infraction of the Conscience Clause ought to be made as ready as possible, and that the local authority was therefore to be preferred to the Board of Education. The remedy which had existed for the last thirty years had been found to be insufficient. What was the objection of the Government to giving power in this matter to the local education authority? There was nothing in the Bill to provide that the majority of the managers of a school should be laymen; on the contrary, one was bound to assume that if they were technically laymen they would be ecclesiastically-minded, and he certainly preferred the regular parson to the ecclesiastically-minded layman. All the Amendment asked was that an aggrieved party should have a ready remedy, and he submitted that to give the power to the local education authority was thoroughly consistent with the principle of the Bill.

MR. SEELY (Lincoln) opposed the Amendment, which he contended would have an effect exactly the reverse of that which hon. Gentlemen desired. All, of course, wished to avoid infractions of the Conscience Clause, and under the Bill as it stood nothing could prevent the County Council, which had a representative on the board of managers, from receiving and inquiring into complaints about such infractions. He could see no possible risk of the Board of Education—which was responsible to Parliament—failing to do its duty in this matter; but he could conceive that there was a possibility—he believed it to be very improbable, however—that, after a bitter party and religious fight, the successful party might refuse to carry out the Conscience Clause in the spirit in which it was regarded by every Member of this House. He hoped that for the sake of simplicity, and in order to avoid trouble in the future, the Committee would reject the Amendment.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said the Attorney General had asserted that the Amendment was impracticable, inconvenient and unnecessary. What did he mean by the last suggestion?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Under the Bill as it stands the local authority have power to bring these matters before the Board of Education; hence the Amendment is unnecessary.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON asserted that there was nothing in the Bill which conferred on the local education authority either the power or the duty of interfering with respect to infractions of the Conscience Clause. Did the hon. and learned Gentleman suggest that the managers had the power specified in the Amendment? Suppose the Conscience Clause were infringed by a teacher; would the board of managers have power to deal with complaints in the manner suggested in the Amendment? It was only reasonable that they should have it.

(1.0.) SIR ROBERT FINLAY said it was admitted that the alleged cases were extremely rare. ["No."] The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton said expressly that such cases were rare.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said the question was not as to the rarity of the cases, but as to the expected character of the board of managers under the new law. The Attorney General said that under the new law things would be quite different. But they did not yet know how the majority of the board of management was to be constituted. There were to be four foundation managers, but no further definition had been given. It could only be inferred that the four new managers were to be somewhat of the same character as those under the existing trust deeds. According to the trust deed, of which he had a copy, there would be the principal clergyman of the parish, his curate——

* THE CHAIRMAN: Really, the hon. Member is now discussing the character of the board of managers in detail.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he was answering the argument of the Attorney General that there was no need of the Amendment because the managers would be of a certain kind. He was going on to show that that kind consisted of the clergyman, his curate, and two persons who were willing to swear that for the last two years they had been communicating members of the Church of England. He did not know that that was a board more to be trusted than the local authority.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire) asked whether, supposing an admitted infraction of the Conscience Clause were brought to the attention of the local education authority, it would constitute a good ground for the dismissal of the offending teacher under the previous portion of the Clause. If that question were answered in the affirmative, the Government might reasonably claim to have the best of the argument. If, however, the answer were in the negative, those whose consciences had been outraged by the infraction of the Conscience Clause would be a great deal worse off than before. At present the Board of Education had power to suspend the grant straight away, and the offending school suffered a direct loss, and the managers had to maintain it out of their own pockets. The Clause would have to do with people who wished to go as far as they could in the direction of infringing the Conscience Clause, and consequently, knowing the local education authority would not go the length of putting them out of the list of public elementary schools and building a school at the ratepayers' expense, the offending parties would push the infraction of the Conscience Clause a great deal further than they would otherwise do.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY thought the hon. Member had misunderstood the objection of his hon. friends to the Amendment. They thought it unnecessary because the local education authority, as the Bill stood, undoubtedly had power to report to the Board of Education. The case supposed was that of a teacher who was so active that the Government grant to the school was lost. Whether that was an "educational ground" he did not like to be too certain, but it seemed to be uncommonly near it, because if the teacher continued in his courses the Government grant would be forfeited. But the way in which the scheme would work in such a case was, that the local authority would call the attention of the managers to what was going on, and to the fact that the school would lose the Government grant, and be no longer maintained out of the rates if the practices were continued.

Mr. BLACK said the hon. and learned Member had hardly answered his question; he would really like a "yes" or "no" answer.

* **Mr. YOXALL** said that, while it might be true that cases of infraction of Clause 7 and the Conscience Clause might be very rare, when they did occur they occurred not through the fault of the teacher of his own instance and option, but as the result of stress and influence placed upon him by the managers—particularly the clerical manager. The Committee would, therefore, do well to consider the matter from the point of view of what the clerical managers would do in this respect. So long as the typical trust deed of the National Society was accepted, the sole authority in the last resort would be the incumbent of the parish. Of late years there had been growing up in the denominational schools, a new difficulty with regard to the Conscience Clause—a difficulty not as between the Established Church teacher and the child of a Dissenter, but as between the child of a Low Churchman and the teaching imposed on the school by a High Church clergyman. The Clause under consideration and the Conscience Clause dependent upon it, hardly met that situation. A separate class-room and some kind of separate teaching could be provided for the children withdrawn because their parents were Nonconformists or Jews, but that provision could not be made for half the children in the Church schools who might be withdrawn from the teaching in the religious hour because that teaching had become imbued by the instructions of a clergyman of High Church character. The appeal to the Board of Education was not efficacious, and it seemed to him that there was a good case made out for carrying the existing law farther than had been the case in the past.

* **The CHAIRMAN** pointed out that the remarks of the hon. Member were not relevant to the Amendment.

***Mr. YOXALL** said he thought it was the duty of the Committee to see that a better method of putting the existing law into operation was obtained.

*(1.15.) **Sir W. HART DYKE** (Kent, Dartford) said that so far as the discussion had gone it paid high testimony to the utility of the operation of the Bill. Whatever difficulties there might have been in the past with regard to parents, at all events, when this Bill became law, they would not fail to disappear. As he understood the matter, hon. Members opposite were not satisfied with the Bill as it stood, and they wanted to know how it would operate in the case of difficulties raised

by the parents. Hon. Members opposite seemed to forget that whatever happened the Board of Education would not part with the absolute control they had over elementary education. Control must be absolute with them, for they held the purse strings, and wherever a case existed which was detrimental to good education they would retain in the future the power which they had today. The local education authority, so far as the Bill was concerned, were absolutely supreme in dealing with all secular education, but he apprehended that where a chaotic state of things existed in regard to religious differences the local education authority would have power to interfere.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: The Attorney General has told us the opposite.

*Sir W. HART DYKE said the local authority were responsible for good education in every school in their district, and if a state of things existed through the action of the managers which produced strong religious feelings of bitterness, that would be hostile to education in that school and destructive of its success. There must be unity of action between the two authorities, and hon. Members opposite seemed to forget that the first general Clause laid down distinctly that this authority was to act in accordance with a scheme which had to be approved by the Board of Education. Therefore there must be unity of action between these two bodies as regarded all difficulties. Both these bodies were responsible for public funds, one to the locality and the other at Whitehall, and they were also responsible for providing a good education and for the conducting of education in every school in England and Wales. The first thing that would happen in a case of difficulty would be that the representative of the local authority would at once call attention to the state of affairs existing in that particular school. There would be an inquiry. The local authority would say to the Education Committee: "There are very great grievances in connection with this school, and we have had complaints." They would have to make an inquiry, and if their investigations satisfied them that the state of things existing in that school was injurious to education, they would call the attention of the head authority at Whitehall, which would be responsible for the scheme, to the matter. What would be the result? The education authority at Whitehall would immediately call the attention of the managers to the same thing, and say to them "This state of things cannot continue, and if it does we shall refuse your grant." That was not an unfair description of what would take place. When the hon. Member mentioned the grievances of all these parents with respect to the religious difficulty, he must again remind the Committee of the earnest speech made by the head representative of the Union of Teachers, in which he stated emphatically that after twenty years' experience as a teacher in board schools and voluntary schools in this country, he knew of no case of complaint in regard to religious education. He had tried to explain to the Committee what he thought would be the common-sense arrangement under the Act.

Sir HENRY FOWLER said he should like to put a concrete case, which he had already alluded to upon a former occasion. In this instance the children had been withdrawn from religious teaching at the commencement of the school on account of the conscientious objection of their parents. The children had already walked miles upon a pouring wet morning, and upon presenting themselves at the school these children were told by the manager of the school or the teacher—"No, you are not entitled to come in now; the school has not commenced yet for secular education. You must remain outside until the religious instruction is over." Could the commencement of the school be set apart for religious instruction, and would the local managers of that school be entitled to say, "You have nothing whatever to do with the time table. This is religious education, and we can do what we like." What power had they got to deal with that case under this Bill? The Attorney General said there were certain powers which would obviate this complaint. The hon. Member for Tewkesbury said it would be illegal to do it, but that a common-sense Board of Managers would do it. His right hon. friend the Member for Dartford had drawn a picture of what would take place, and that was very much what they wanted to take place; but it would be prevented from taking place by these very conditions. In the case he had given the managers of the school did not violate the Conscience Clause.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said if there was no violation of the Conscience Clause it had no bearing opon the Amendment. The question as to what would happen under those circumstances, it being admitted that there was no infraction of the Conscience Clause, was one which he had better not deal with on this Amendment.

(1.25.) MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said the Attorney-General said this case was not legally a breach of the Conscience Clause.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I did not say that. I said that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton put a case assuming that there was no breach of the Conscience Clause. This Amendment deals only with cases in which there has been a breach of the Conscience Clause.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that when a person complained about this breach of the Conscience Clause the Education Department were entitled to say, "It is not a distinct breach and we are not entitled to interfere." If such complaints were made to the local authority they could go and see the managers, and the grievances could be immediately remedied. They might not have the actual legal right, but being the local authority and having the power to see into it, they would see that the particular complaint was remedied. The great advantage of this Amendment would be that these grievances would be dealt with at once by the education authority. Everybody admitted that the Education Department had full power to deal with this matter, but it did not follow that they were necessarily in a position to deal with it. These disputes were very much personal questions, and turned upon a very slight difference of evidence; and it was the most difficult thing in the world to deal with a religious question. The Education Department had very often to deal with these questions upon paper evidence, and this method was so difficult that very often the Department felt obliged not to take any action, because it would involve the whole cessation of grants to that particular school. On the other hand, when it came to the local authority sending one of their body to talk the matter over with the teachers and parents, it was obvious they would be able to deal with many of these difficulties. He thought the most valuable contribution in favour of this Amendment was the speech of the right hon. Member for Dartford. They desired that the local authority should have power to deal with these matters. The Attorney-General had argued that they could not give this power to two different authorities, and that therefore it must remain, as at present, in the hands of the Department. The speech of the hon. Member for Tewkesbury seemed to be absolutely sound in favour of the Amendment. They should put into the Bill what the local authority was to do where there was a breach of the Conscience Clause.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR appealed to the Committee to bring this discussion to a close. He thought the arguments on both sides had now been placed before the Committee.

SIR JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington) said that cases were very rare under the Conscience Clause, but everybody was aware that they did sometimes occur. When they did arise the local authority should be in a position to receive complaints and make inquiry. He ventured to say that it was a condition precedent to the inquiry that the local authority should have power to receive complaints in regard to the matter to be inquired into.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock) said he believed the control originally provided in the Bill was sufficient for all purposes, but the Committee had seen fit to amplify that control in certain particulars. Having made that departure he thought they were now dealing with one of the most important points that could come up. While he did not share the fears of the Nonconformists in connection with this Bill, he thought it would be a concession to the spirit of perhaps unreasonable suspicion and would remove some feeling of uneasiness if the Amendment were accepted. He held that eight Churchmen out of ten were as anxious as Nonconformists to deal justly with the claims of Nonconformists, but here and there they had unreasonable clergymen or Churchmen who did not appreciate the conscientious feelings of the Nonconformists. The acceptance of the Amendment would secure that whatever that unwise clergyman sought to deal disrespectfully with the conscientious feelings of Nonconformists the local authority would have specific directions to deal with the case. Consequently, he, as a warm supporter of the main principles of the Bill, believed that the acceptance of the Amendment or of similar words. would remove the feeling of anxiety and tend to promote the cordial co-operation which they all hoped would be shown in carrying out the provision of the Bill.

*MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) said he would state facts in his own experience, which would, he thought, be much more convincing than some of the speeches the Committee had heard, He knew a village, partly manufacturing. partly farming, in which it had been the custom of the clergymen from time to time to take the children out of the school—it was a one-school village—into the church at eleven o'clock on certain saints' days. Who these saints were he did not know. The largest proportion of the children in this Church school were those of Nonconformist parents. He took upon himself to inquire why those Nonconformist parents did not withdraw their children from school or complain of their being brought into church to be taught the Church catechism and other things. They said they did not want to make complaints. A blacksmith in the village said to him, "Oh, you know our customers are farmers in the district, and it would not do to make these complaints. Another man, a grocer, said, "I do take an active part in the chapel, but there are plenty of farmers round here who are customers. They come and get things in my shop and I do not want to offend them." That was the state of things they wanted to deal with by the Amendment. The inspector would come in contact with the cases in the schools, and complaints might be made to him by the parents, though they would not venture to complain direct to the Department in Whitehall.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said anyone who knew anything whatever of the strong position taken up by the Nonconformists with regard to this Bill must recognise the fact that one of the results of passing the Bill would be an increase of sectarian bitterness in every parish throughout the kingdom. One of the results also would be that more people would avail themselves of the Conscience Clause than in the past. On the other hand, when they had small men as managers of schools a certain amount of reprisals would be undertaken, and there might be more petty tyranny than in the past. He did not say that there would be many of those tyrannies. His own experience was that the managers and clergymen were broad-minded men, but there was no doubt whatever that there was an intolerant minority, and it was their duty to protect the children against that minority when there was any infraction of the Conscience Clause. It seemed to him that there was only one way proposed by the Bill, namely, to threaten the managers that the grant would be withdrawn and a new school built. That was an utterly absurd threat to make. It was using a steam-hammer to crush an egg-shell. He would support the Amendment.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said Section 7 of the Act of 1870 had worked very well indeed. The infractions had been rare. He believed the whole Committee would accept that view. [Cries of "No."] Then he believed the great bulk of the Committee would admit that the infractions had been rare. Notwithstanding that he suggested to the Prime Minister the extreme desirableness of accepting the substance of the Amendment at any rate. Under Clause 6 of this Bill the local authority would have all the powers and duties of the School Board affecting their own schools. They would do exactly what School Boards had done in the past under Section 7 of the Act of 1870. What was to be done with regard to the non-provided schools? They had given to local authority full control over secular education, but this was not secular education. He was dealing with the non-provided schools, and under the law, as it stood, which would be incorporated in the present Bill, the local education authority would have no right to make any inquiry in regard to any complaint.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that the appointed managers would look after them.

Dr. MACNAMARA said he understood the other night that the managers were to work as a whole. Two of the managers had no right to inquire into this matter and the other four had. [Ministerial cries of "No, no."] Well, all the six managers had, and they were to represent their complaint to the Board of Education. [Cries of "Yes."] Very well, now they were getting this matter cleared up. The two public representatives and the four trust managers could inquire into any infraction of sub-Sections 1 and 2 of the Act of 1870, and make representations to the Board of Education, but they were not to make their representations to the local education authority. [Cries from the Ministerial Benches of "No, no."] No, because the education authority would have no power.

*The CHAIRMAN said that if that view was enforced, the Amendment was out of order.

Dr. MACNAMARA said that that was not a matter for him. At the bottom of the sub-Section it was set forth that any scholar might be withdrawn by his parent from religious instruction without forfeiting any benefits of the scholar. Well, if the scholar was withdrawn that was a matter on which the education authority would have no control, although they had control over secular education. He contended that the system of the provided schools and the non-provided schools should be exactly the same. He would ask the Prime Minister to accept this form of Amendment, viz., to leave out the words "deal with," and to make it read "and to receive, inquire into, and represent to the Education Department any complaints," etc. That would leave the law absolutely fair with regard to both sets of schools, and the procedure would be in both what it was now in regard to the board schools.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'deal with,' and insert the words 'represent to the Board of Education.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he could not agree quite with his hon. friend that the local authority could not now, or should not, under the Bill, have the power to deal with complaints of this kind; and he confessed he preferred the words as moved by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen. All that they asked was that the same powers should be given in the case of the non-provided schools as in the case of the provided schools. They wanted to have the same power that if a teacher, paid by the local authority, was guilty of an infraction of the Conscience Clause he could be dismissed by the local authority. He understood from the Attorney-General that the local authority had a power of inquiry. He would put a case of this sort. Suppose the local authority called for an explanation from the Board of Managers, and that they said "You have nothing to do with it; this is purely a religious question." Take another point. Suppose that a local inquiry was to be held, and that the managers were called upon to attend, but refused. What means had the county authority of compelling them?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: How could we confer any power to compel managers to answer questions? If the managers did not answer questions, they would be self-condemned.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he could not agree with his right hon. friend. If it was not made part of the function of the local authority to deal with those complaints, but if it was the business of the Board of Education, they would have a perfect right to refuse to answer questions or to give an explanation. That was the whole point. This discussion was becoming simply farcical when it was suggested that the Bill was to be administered by means of complaints through the penny post to the Education Department by any one out of thirty-five millions of people. Was that the administration and control of secular education? What they wanted to know was if there was to be an effective right of inquiry, and to call for evidence or explanations on the part of the managers in their defence. As the Bill stood, the managers might say "This is no business of yours." The Prime Minister constantly replied, "You have your own managers, and they can make inquiry," but they were in a permanent minority.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that even a minority could take independent action.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that it struck him sometimes that a minority might have a monopoly of administration. All that they asked for was that the minority should have the right of a proper inquiry into the facts when the majority of the managers did not want inquiry. The two representative managers could only act as a part of the body to which they belonged, and the moment they began to act on their own initiative they ceased to act as managers, and only acted as individuals. They had no power. Here was one of the best tests as to whether the Nonconformists of the country were going to be protected by this Bill. He was glad that this Amendment had been moved; it showed that all the talk about complete control was really not intended, and that the position would be in the future as it had been in the past.

(1.58.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 1 8; Noes, 79. (Division List No. 418.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGerald W.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Barry,Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst,Hon.Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell,RtHn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carew, James Lawrence
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish,V.C,W,(Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHon.J.(Birm.)
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb,SirJohnCharlesReady
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald,Sir RobertPenrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary(St. Albans)
Godson,SirAugustus Frederick
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury,Rt.Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath,ArthurHoward (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Hobhouse Henry (Somerset,E.
Hope,J.F. (Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareh'm
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol,S
Lowe, Francis William

Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macartney,RtHn.W.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ(Walthmstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Peel,Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley,Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde (BethnalGreen
Ritchie,RtHnCharlesThomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col SirC.E.H.(Sheff'ld
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Col. C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Williams,RtHnJPowell-(Birm.
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Worsley-Taylor,Henry Wilson
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther

NOES.

Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar,John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt.Hon.Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorgeSmyth
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment," put accordingly, and agreed to.

(2.8.) Question put, "That the proposed words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 86; Noes, 171. (Division List No. 419.) (2.22.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,Charles P(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bignold, Arthur
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston

Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Crombie, John William
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carn'rvonshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Schwann, Charles E.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Wm. M'Arthur.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hamilton Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Helder, Augustus
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry

Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Stanley, Edwards Jas (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffi'ld
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(2.52.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, who had an Amendment on the Paper providing that the local education authority shall have power to inspect the school, "and their inspectors shall present yearly to the Education Department their reports as to the state and efficiency of the schools," said he understood that the previous evening objection was taken to an Amendment with reference to inspection, and it was indicated that another place might be found in the Bill to deal with the subject separately. If this was the case, then he would postpone what he had to say on the subject of inspection until the point was raised later. He would like, however, to have a clear understanding from the Government that there would be a future opportunity to discuss the Question.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the previous evening, in opposition to an Amendment similar in character to that of the right hon. Gentleman, objection was raised that it imposed a condition on the maintenance of public elementary schools which they themselves had no opportunity of fulfilling, because it rested with the local education authority, and, in the case of the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment, not even with the local authority, but the local authority's inspectors. The Amendment, therefore, was not only out of place, but it would reduce the Clause to absurdity. It was also pointed out that if the subject of inspection was to be treated it should be treated as a whole at a different stage in the Bill. There would no doubt be an opportunity of raising the question, but he was not in a position to give any pledge that the Government would create that opportunity. It would have to be created by hon. Members opposite, but that such an opportunity would arise he thought there could be no doubt.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said that an opportunity to which the Government were not favourable was not much of an opportunity. He did not think the Committee could accept the statement of the hon. Member with any great expectation that the subject of inspection would be considered at all. If that was the case, he might as well state on the Amendment he had placed on the Paper why he thought the subject of inspection should be dealt with in the Bill.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY appealed to the right hon. Gentleman not to proceed with his Amendment. The words proposed would add as a condition to the right of maintenance that the inspectors should present yearly to the Education Department their reports as to the state of efficiency of the schools. The performance of that duty rested entirely with the inspectors of the local education authority, and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman not to propose an Amendment which laid down as a condition of the right of a school to maintenance something which rested entirely in the option of the local education authority inspectors. It was putting in something as a condition which, however right it might be in its proper place, was meaningless and repugnant in the Clause. He thought, indeed, that the subject was really a point of order.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said that it might be desirable in that case to make his Amendment mandatory, and not conditional. He assumed that the education authority would inspect the schools. It was essential that there should be inspection by this authority for this reason. There was to be a county rate for these schools, and the ratepayers ought to know what was the general condition of the schools for which they were to pay that rate. This could only be known by reports made to them as to the condition of each school. If those reports were satisfactory the ratepayers would then say, "Very well, we will agree to the rate." The county authority had a right to say that they would not pay the rate to support machinery which was not doing the work for which such a rate ought to be raised, and it was perfectly plain that if they did not have some provision of this kind the ratepayers of the county would be entitled to resist the rate, because no account would be rendered to them of the condition of the schools for which they paid. They would not know whether they were paying for things which were worth the money. It should be the business of the education authority, through an inspection of every school in the county, to render an account to the ratepayers of what they were paying for. How were the county authority to render an account to the ratepayers of the condition of the schools in respect of which the rate was levied? He did not wish to prolong this discussion now if there was an understanding that there would be an opportunity given of dealing with the question of inspection. Every ratepayer had a right to refuse the rate unless the education authority rendered an account of how the rate was expended, and what was the condition of the schools upon which it had been expended. That seemed absolutely vital to this question. There must be a record kept of the condition of the schools by the people who were responsible to the Education Department. This must be placed upon record, so that every ratepayer in the county might know that the school had been inspected by the local authority. This question had nothing to do with the Education Department in London, for no one could answer for this inspection except the local education authority. If it was out of place at this stage, he was perfectly willing to raise this distinct question upon another occasion if the Government would give an opportunity of considering the question of inspection, without which no ratepayer was bound to pay the rate. He assumed that there would be an inspection, for the local authority must satisfy themselves that the schools were in a proper condition.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 12, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'and their inspectors shall present yearly to the Education Department their reports as to the state and efficiency of the schools.'"—(*Sir William Harcourt.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

(3.5.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not press his Amendment, because it was absurd and impossible where it was now proposed.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he had already stated that he was perfectly willing to yield to that objection if they had an indication that this matter would be dealt with as a separate matter.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the right hon. Gentleman should raise the question of inspection in some place where it could be reasonably dealt with. His right hon. friend admitted that it was not very important that this question should be raised here, and considering the extraordinary amount of time they were spending over these points he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not press his Amendment. But he quite agreed that the education authority was responsible to the ratepayers, and that it would have not only to submit its accounts to audit, but to make itself acquainted with the condition of the schools in its district. But this was not the place to discuss those excellent objects.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said that he had asked for a statement of that kind at the very commencement of his remarks, and if the right hon. Gentleman thought this was not the proper place to insert such a condition he would yield to that at once. He was perfectly satisfied with the statement the First Lord of the Treasury had made, and he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. BRYCE said that he wished to insert after the word "school" the words "and to determine the time to be allowed for secular instruction and religious instruction respectively."

*The CHAIRMAN said that the object of the Amendment was covered by the words in sub-Section (*a*) providing that the managers should carry out any directions of the local education authority as to secular instruction.

Mr. BRYCE said, if he understood the ruling which had just been given, it was that under the provision with regard to secular education the local authority had full power to determine how much time was to be given to secular instruction, and it was only because this was left in doubt that he moved his Amendment. Under these circumstances he did not wish to detain the Committee.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Do I understand that the authority will have the right to declare what time, what particular hours of the day, shall be given to secular instruction?

*The CHAIRMAN: I should think so. It does not interfere with religious instruction at all. With the hours of religious instruction, I take it, the Committee have decided that the local education authority are to have no power to interefere.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am afraid I have not made myself clear. Let me put a practical illustration. Supposing the local authority were to say that secular instruction shall be given between the hours of 9 and 11.30, and the managers said "We are anxious that religious instruction shall be given between 9 and 9.30," what is to happen?

*The CHAIRMAN: I think the managers would have to begin their religious instruction at 8.30.

*Mr. HERBERT ROBERTSON (Hackney, S.) moved to leave out all the words of the sub-Section after the word "school." The effect of the sub-Section as it stood was that the managers were to keep the accounts. He believed none of them wanted that, but that all of them wanted the local education authority to keep its own accounts. This difficulty had been foreseen by several hon. Members opposite who had put down Amendments on this point. He took it that the managers would be bound to dispose of the money in a particular manner, and be the actual agents of the authority. The hon. Member for North Camberwell had put down an Amendment which would take away the power of audit from the education authority and give it to the Education Department.

Dr. MACNAMARA: No; to the Local Government Board.

*Mr. HERBERT ROBERTSON said he apprehended that the real object of the hon. Member's Amendment was to have the account of the local education authority audited by the Local Government Board. He did not think he need say any more upon this point, for he thought he had shown conclusively that the words in the Bill would give managers the power of keeping accounts and saying how the money was to be spent.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 12, to leave out from the word 'school,' to end of line 13."—(*Mr. Herbert Robertson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'and the accounts' stand part of the Clause."

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said he believed that, on the point of law, the Government, if they agreed to this Amendment, would be on the right lines. He agreed that they were the accounts of the education authority, and not of the managers at all, and that, even if these words were omitted, they would be subject to an audit. But the question was, what sort of an audit? This matter had always been one of great complexity and difficulty. At the present moment the accounts of School Boards were subject to a satisfactory audit under the Act of 1870. They were audited at the office of the School Board, and the School Board districts, being mostly small in area, there was a very close analogy between them and the voluntary schools. The audit held at the office of the School Board within the school district by the district auditor was one which was thoroughly satisfactory, but it did not apply to the voluntary schools, and the result was that the finance of voluntary schools was of the weirdest character. He had been allowed to peruse the accounts of some voluntary schools, and he did not think it would be denied by the strongest friends of voluntary schools that, although their accounts were not wickedly fraudulent, they were sometimes fraudulent in the sense of not having much relation to the facts. He admitted that there were cases where the accounts were admirably kept in voluntary schools but the present practice of voluntary schools had led to the most extraordinary finance in the case of some of them. Under the Act of 1897, the audit of the accounts of voluntary schools had sometimes been disastrously bad, and he did not think they should part with these words until they knew exactly what was going to happen. Everything turned on what the practical character of the audit was going to be.

*MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON said the accounts now would not be those of the managers but of the local education authority, and he agreed that they should be well audited.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said they could not part with those words until they knew exactly what was going to happen, and while he agreed that the Bill, without those words, made the accounts of voluntary schools subject to a Local Government Board audit, his point was that everything turned upon what the practical character of that audit was going to be. The present audit of School Board accounts and Parish Councils was perfectly satisfactory, for it gave expressly the power to every parochial elector to be present at all times to take copies, and inspect the accounts, and it directly promoted the raising of individual objections by individual ratepayers. The result had been that an enormous number of individual objections had been raised, both in the case of School Boards and in the case of Parish Councils. They had been objections which had either been sustained and surcharged or allowed and remitted by the Local Government Board under their equitable jurisdiction. Those objections they had got to encourage. He was afraid that the other kind of Local Government Board audit, to which County Councils were subjected, might be the audit under this Bill, and if the audit of the accounts of voluntary schools was only that kind of audit it would not be satisfactory, and it would not check these abuses, and would not have the effect which the audit had had in the case of small School Boards and Parish Councils. There were seldom any objections in the case of the county audit, where the individual ratepayer did not appear very much. A separate auditor, from time to time, had been appointed, and the accounts being of extraordinary bulk and detail it was the clerks really who did the work, and the individual ratepayer did not come in at all and did not attend. If the accounts of County Councils were good enough to pass muster they seldom raised these controversial questions, but the accounts of voluntary schools were of a totally different character. It would not be safe for them simply to accept these general principles. They ought to have a definite statement of what would be done. He agreed that the Local Government Board had full powers, that their staff was good on the whole, and that they ought to be allowed to deal with the matter. But the question was how it was to be dealt with, and that was very important. The Committee should have in advance some sketch of the way in which the Local Government Board was going to act in future.

(3.30.) THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.) said the right hon. Gentleman had dealt with two subjects, one of which ought to come under Clause 13, and not under that the Committee were now discussing. Clause 13 dealt with the question of audit and would come before the Committee for discussion later on, but at the same time there was no objection to state the view of the Government as to the question now before them. The proposal in the Bill as it stood was one which he thought all were agreed would not satisfactorily meet the case. The object was that the accounts of the authority responsible for the disbursement of the money should be audited by responsible auditors. When the Bill passed all the revenue of the schools derived from rates or Government grants would be received, not by the School Boards or by the managers of the voluntary schools, but by the local education authority. It was the accounts of the local authority, therefore, and not the parochial or district accounts, which ought to be subjected to a strict system of audit. If the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet were to be adopted, it would be necessary to have two audits, one of the local education authority's accounts, and the other of the parochial accounts. The latter would be of little value, but it would add enormously to the work of the auditors and involve considerable expenditure. As the Committee knew, the costs of the audit system of the country were met almost entirely by charges in the shape of stamps, and it would be very unfair to put on the managers the cost of the audit of their parochial school accounts. On the other hand, it would be unjust to charge that cost to the County Council, because they would have to pay twice over for the audit. What was desired was that there should be a Government audit by district auditors, perfectly independent of any Government Department, although appointed by the Government. They would exercise their powers in a judicial capacity, and see that the money spent had been spent according to law. That audit was as complete as it could well be. The Government proposed to accept the Amendment, and, by the omission of these words, to subject the accounts of the local education authority to the ordinary system of Government audit which obtained at the present time.

MR. M'KENNA: What about the voluntary schools in a borough?

MR. WALTER LONG said sub-Section 3 of Clause 13 dealt specially with the accounts of schools in the area of a borough. That sub-Section set forth—

"Separate accounts shall be kept by the council of a borough of their receipts and expenditure under this Act, and those accounts shall be made up and audited in like manner and subject to the same provisions as the accounts of a County Council, and the enactments relating to the audit of those accounts, and to all matters incidental thereto and consequential thereon, including the penal provisions, shall apply."

It was therefore unnecessary to provide in the sub-Section now before the Committee for the audit of the accounts of schools in a borough area. In this particular case the Government would accept the Amendment in order to make it clear that the audit was to be a Government audit, and not the audit suggested in the words proposed to be left out. If it were necessary to make it perfectly clear that the audit was to be a regular one in all senses, words would have to be added in Clause 13. As the law stood at present, County Council accounts were liable to audit in the ordinary way, and therefore, after the passing of this Act, all their accounts in connection with education would come under that general law. It was necessary to deal with the borough question in Clause 13.

SIR HENRY FOWLER said he hardly followed the right hon. Gentleman in the scheme he had proposed. The words proposed to be left out—

"And the accounts of the managers shall be subject to audit by that authority,"

were very important. If these words were left out the practical result would be that the accounts of the managers would not be audited at all.

*MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON said they would have no accounts that were to be audited by the local authority.

SIR HENRY FOWLER did not understand that that was so. The right hon. Gentleman had objected to a system of parochial audit.

MR. WALTER LONG said he did not think he objected to what he might have called parochial accounts, but pointed out that the accounts would be kept by the local education authority. If there were parochial accounts, they would be merely a repetition of the accounts so kept.

SIR HENRY FOWLER said what they really wanted was an audit of the parochial expenditure on a school—he referred to the expenditure of public money. The audit of the whole accounts of a great county, which might have a thousand schools in its area, would be absolutely useless for checking local inaccuracy, extravagance, or even illegal expenditure on the schools. At present they had a perfect system of local audit in every parish, conducted by Government auditors, under conditions which enabled them to see when an item of expenditure was illegal. Mr. Cockerton had stated even in London when expenditure was illegal. The accounts of the Parish Councils were audited, and he noticed from the report which had just been presented to Parliament by the President of the Local Government Board that the number of parochial accounts audited last year was between 7,000 and 8,000. The staff of the Local Government Board would be quite equal to the work. They had already to go into every parish where there was a Parish Council and every parish where there was a School Board, so that the addition to their labours would be very small indeed. What the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean wanted was that the people who paid the rates should have full knowledge of improper expenditure, and that they should have the right to go to the public auditor and say they were not legally entitled to be rated or taxed for that expenditure. If they took the whole of the accounts of the West Riding of Yorkshire, the audit would be absolutely useless so far as the expenditure in the parishes was concerned. What did the Government mean when they put these words in the Bill as drawn? The Government had said all along that they meant to give the local authority control over all the expenditure for secular education. This did not mean that they would deal with every item. They would allot to a certain school a certain sum of money, and they would fix the teachers' salaries. The expenditure would take place under the control of the managers, and under the Bill as originally brought in one of the conditions of their obtaining their position was to be that their accounts should be subject to the audit of the local education authority. If this sub-Section was left out they would get rid altogether of this audit, which was the most valuable of all. Unless they had a more distinct declaration of what the Government intended, he would oppose the deletion of the words.

MR. WALTER LONG said that he had endeavoured to make clear to the House that the details in regard to the audit must come up upon Clause 13. The auditor must hold as responsible for the expenditure of public money the one authority which had power to spend that money—that was to say, the local education authority, and not the managers. The Government proposed to make the audit a regular Government audit, and if it were necessary in Clause 13 to make their intentions clearer they would do so then.

SIR HENRY FOWLER asked the right hon. Gentleman whether they were to understand that in Clause 13 he would insert words making it perfectly clear that the audit was to be a local one.

MR. WALTER LONG said that that was part of the regulations issued in regard to the audit. He would much rather wait until they came to Clause 13 and state then what appeared to be the Government's view of the right way in which to draw up the regulations. It seemed to him that they should provide for local publication and local investigation. As the right hon. Gentleman knew, it was the duty of the auditor to satisfy himself, before he gave his certificate, that the accounts had been properly kept and the money properly spent, and it would be impossible for the auditor to satisfy himself on these accounts unless he carried his investigation further than the county town. Therefore he thought that not only local publication but local investigation would be necessary.

(3.58.) SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said the right hon. Gentleman's statement seemed perfectly satisfactory with regard to the general fund spent by the education authority. But there was the subsidiary question of certain funds which might have been spent by the managers. In some form or another there ought to be an audit of these. It seemed necessary that the education authority should audit that particular kind of account.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said the question really raised by the Clause was not the audit of the accounts of the local education authority at all. It was the accounts of the managers. Under the wording of the Clause as already passed, the education authority would have full power to insist on the managers keeping certain accounts. That was constantly done already by the county authorities. In his particular county, a county treasurer was appointed to investigate the accounts of the district bodies with which the County Council had to deal. That was in addition to the Government audit. He knew from his own personal experience that the audit was of the most searching and minute character.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he entirely agreed with the Government that the words referred to ought to be deleted. He had himself put an Amendment on the Paper to that effect, believing that the words in the sub-Section were unnecessary. Their conclusion might give rise to inferences derogatory to the authority of the County Council. Why were the words unnecessary? He understood that now the school managers would have no money at all of their own. That was a very serious position indeed for the voluntary schools. All the income of the voluntary schools from all sources would go into the hotchpot of the County Council. None of the money would proceed out of it to the manager except what the County Council allowed. The County Council need not employ managers at all for one single item of expenditure. They might pay the teachers and all the expenses of the school by agents of their own; they might select one or two managers and make them their agents; they might select an outsider and make him their agent; or they might make the whole body of managers their agents. In the latter case, the liability of the managers to account to their principal would be the same as if the agent had been a clerk. Therefore the managers would only have power of expenditure which was the result of delegation, and that delegation not only gave the right of audit but the right of calling to account.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said they ought not to allow the words to go out until they saw what the Government proposed as their substitute. It was exceedingly important that there should be an audit, and a searching one. The President of the Local Government Board had stated that all the money passed through the hands of the County Council. When the auditor came round the County Council might say, "We have given a cheque to the managers in respect of the accounts of that school and this is the voucher for that cheque." He asked the Parliamentary Secretary how the money was to be paid. Was the county treasurer to pay by cheque to the managers in order that they might pay the teachers, or was the treasurer to pay the salaries of the staff direct?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I cannot answer for the proceedings of a body which has not come into existence.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Committee ought to know what was contemplated by the Bill. This was really very essential as bearing on the question of audit and control. They were now making the teachers part of the staff of the County Council (that was the theory of the Government), just as a road surveyor, or a stonebreaker was. Was the money paid by the County Council direct, or to the teachers by precept to the managers? Did the managers say, "Here is a Budget; we want £500 to carry on with; will you give us that sum for this session?" That would make a great difference to the audit.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the details of every sum handed over to the managers would be subject to the review of the district auditors.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that was not an answer to his question. What he wanted to know was whether the money would be paid direct to the teachers, or to the managers.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: That would be for the local education department to decide.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he wished to press the matter further. It was not merely the vouchers of the managers that were to be submitted to the auditor, but the actual receipts ?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Yes.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the explanations of Ministers were more satisfactory than the Bill. It was very important that the audit should be a local one. At the present moment the School Board accounts were examined upon the spot. Unless a right to inspect the accounts was given it would put it out of the power of an individual ratepayer to raise an objection at all. Take for instance the purchase of an harmonium for a school. If it was purchased by the managers out of the religious fund they might charge a rent for it, if it was used in the school, and that was a question which some individual ratepayer might wish to raise before the auditor. They knew perfectly well how very important the auditor now was. Mr. Cockerton had revolutionised the whole school administration throughout the country. He would be very glad if the President of the Local Government Board gave the assurance that an opportunity would be given to the ratepayers to raise objections to the accounts.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (MR. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk), said that that would be provided for in the regulations which would be made by the Department.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said it should be in the Bill. A system which worked perfectly fairly in regard to merely secular matters was turned topsy-turvy when they came to touch religion. This Bill was an illustration of that. In the ordinary affairs in life the man who paid was the man who had control, but in religious affairs one man paid and another spent. The difficulty they were in was that they could not accept anything on trust for this Government. They should see that the audit would be carried out in a thorough and most searching manner before they passed from this Clause. This Clause was the last straw to which they could cling. [Cheers and laughter from the MINISTERIAL Benches.] Yes, but it might be the straw that would break the camel's back. They must have some assurance on this matter. When the Grant-in-Aid Bill was passing through the House they were told that although 5s. per child was to be paid, a *quid pro quo* was being given in the shape of a thoroughly good system of audit. But the system had not been thoroughly effective, for the 5s. per child had been paid for five years and no account of it had been given at all. Before they parted from their rates, and £900,000 in addition, they had a right to know beforehand that there was something in the Act of Parliament itself providing for an audit being carried out in a thoroughly effective manner, and not merely an expression of opinion by a minister, however honest he might be. School Boards kept their accounts properly by thoroughly trained clerks; why should not clergymen be compelled to do the same ?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: They would be.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought that the right hon. Gentleman was exceedingly rash in giving a pledge for 20,000 clergymen.

MR. WALTER LONG said he would give his word for it that the district auditors would adopt the system which was at present in use in other Departments. They could not give their certificates unless they were satisfied that the expenditure was legal and that the accounts were accurate.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that that explanation would be excellent if they could get it in the Bill. Would the right hon. Gentleman guarantee to turn on those district auditors, see that the accounts were published in the locality, and that an opportunity was given to every individual ratepayer to examine them, and enter his protest against any item he objected to ?

DR. MACNAMARA said that all the money from public sources—Treasury grants and rates — was to go to the local authority. Would it be competent to hand the money over to the managers in a lump sum, and would there be a compulsory audit of the details of the expenditure of that money?

MR. WALTER LONG said that the district auditors would not pass the accounts unless they were satisfied that the money handed by the local authority to the managers had been spent in a legitimate manner.

DR. MACNAMARA said that was extremely satisfactory, but it would be very helpful to the local authorities if that intention was set forth in some regulation, or in the Bill.

(4.13.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and moved that the Question be now put.

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 203; Noes, 90. (Division List, No. 420.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Cbarrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn, Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzoy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gouloing, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Middx
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, J. (Midd. Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Kemp, George,
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson

Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (I. of Wight)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt. Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmathen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Schwann, Charles E.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay. T
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersfi'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Rea and Mr. Charles Hobhouse.

When the bell had been rung for a division on the next Question,

MR. ANSTRUTHER (St. Andrews Burghs), seated and covered, said there had been a mistake in the figures announced. The Votes given for the Closure numbered 203, not 223.

MR. REA (Gloucester): 203 is the correct number.

* THE CHAIRMAN: The figure will be altered from 223 to 203.

(4.28.) Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 88; Noes, 205. (Division List No. 421.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Craig, Robert Hunter
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank

Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accringtou
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Schwann, Charles E.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York W.R.
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Rea and Mr. Charles Hobhouse

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Thomas Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V C W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Vicount
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manch'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt, Hn, Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.

Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Peel,HnWm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin. Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, Edward William T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the first word "The," in line 14, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said that the Committee had not yet struck out the rest of the words in sub-Section (*b*). The question put from the Chair was that the words stand part of the sub-Section.

* THE CHAIRMAN: The Question was put in that way according to custom.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the Committee negatived the words which had been put from the Chair, but the following words in sub-Section (*b*) remained. He submitted that although possibly the Committee could not debate the question, because the remaining words had no sense with the first three left out, still, the Committee might divide on these. If the Committee did not vote on these they remained.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think that would be contrary to the usual custom. The custom has grown up, and it is a very proper one, of putting the Question in such a way that if the Question is defeated the right of hon. Members to discuss the subsequent words remains. If the view of the hon. Member were accepted, that custom would have to go by the board. That would be very undesirable, as the custom is really a safeguard.

(4.38.) Question put, "That the Question 'That the first word "The," in line 14, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 199; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 422.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (L'ds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A (Worc'r
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon Thomas H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Man'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, HnG. R. C. Ormsby-(Sal'p
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Rt. HnLd. G. (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George

Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hon William Edw. H
Lee, Arthur H (Hants. Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, RtHnW. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, RtHnA. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne

Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, HonM. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Warde, Col. C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, RtHnJ Powell-(B'rm
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A (Inverness-shire
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David

Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, David Alfred (M'rthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Wallace, Robert
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Alfred Hutton and Mr. Trevelyan.

(4.51.) Question put accordingly "That the first word 'The,' in line 14, stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 200; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 423.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H (Shropshire
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G. R C. Ormsby-(Salop
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt Hon William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Middlemore, Jno. Throgmorton
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdigate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hon J. G (Oxf'd Univ.

Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir CEH (Sheffiedl
Walrond, Rt Hon Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lieut-Col A C E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Craig, Robert Hunter
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

(5.12.) MR. BRYCE: I rise to make an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to allow us to report progress. He has now got on to the third sub-Section, and we are entering into a new and very large and important question. It is not possible to make any substantial progress between this and 5.30, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will allow us to go now. Therefore I beg to move that Progress be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—*(Mr. Bryce.)*

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is with extreme regret that I have heard the appeal of the right hon, Gentleman. I confess that I think the mode in which the opposition to this Bill is being conducted is one which, if persisted in, as regards this and other measures, would make all Parliamentary government impossible. Of the tone and temper of hon. Gentlemen opposite I can most truly say I have nothing whatever to complain. They have invariably behaved—both to me individually and to Gentlemen who sit on this side of the House—with the greatest possible courtesy; and I am glad to think that no undue heat, so far as I know, has at any time been developed in the discussion of a Bill which, I quite grant, outside this House has produced a good deal of heat. Full recognition, I think, is due to the hon. Gentlemen in that matter; but I must point out that something more is at stake at this moment than the mere carrying into law of this particular measure. We have met for the purpose of dealing with this measure specially. We have practically occupied our whole time in dealing with it since we met. We have devoted the greater part of, I think, seven days to this Clause, and we have passed eleven lines of it. Now I do very sincerely ask hon. Gentlemen to reflect whether it is really consistent with the carrying on of any legislative work by this assembly that discussion of this magnitude should be permitted? I quite admit that this is a very important Clause; I do not minimise it. I only ask hon. Gentlemen to consider that a Parliament which is stopped by mere time, mere length of debate, mere multiplication of Amendments, from passing a Bill of this kind, is a Parliament which admits its own impotence. I do not think it is in the interests of either side of the House that our impotence should be admitted. I do hope the right hon. Gentleman will not persist in his Motion.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling, Burghs): I rise to express our acknowledgment to the right hon. Gentleman for the recognition he has given as to our good behaviour.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Courtesy, not good behaviour.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is very good of him, but I do not understand the reason for the little lecture or allocution with which he has favoured us. Though I have taken no part in the last week in these discussions, I have been pretty constant in my attendance, and I appeal to anyone who is interested in the subject, and has followed it at all, whether it is not the case that the Amendments have, almost without exception, been serious and substantial Amendments, and the discussions businesslike discussions. There has been no vain repetition. Amendments have been moved and discussed on either side of the House equally. In fact I see no fault to find with the way in which the debate has been conducted. That it has been a long and tedious debate there is no doubt. But why? Because it is so complicated a matter. It is a matter full of small details, each of which is of the greatest importance; and the Bill is so drawn as almost to invite these Amendments which occupy so much time. But now the right hon. Gentleman thinks that we ought to spend twenty minutes in really doing nothing.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Why shall we be doing nothing?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Because you will not make any progress in that twenty minutes.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We shall get twenty minutes worth of speeches.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Surely the right hon. Gentleman has experience enough of the House to know that any speeches delivered in these twenty minutes will be repeated and amply repeated next day, and necessarily so. We know that the speeches today will be merely beating the air so far as the decision of the question is concerned, and the speeches that will influence the votes that are to be given must be delivered not today, but at the beginning of the next sitting. Therefore the right hon. Gentleman has nothing to gain. I always thought that the right hon. Gentleman was an ardent and determined week-ender, always anxious to shorten the business on Friday. Therefore, I expected that he would gracefully and willingly concede what is asked for, not in the interests of our personal enjoyment, but in the interests of the real progress of the Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that for the Prime Minister to complain of the opposition that had been extended to the Bill argued an exceedingly bad memory on the part of one who took so prominent a part in leading the opposition to the Home Rule Bill. His recollection of that Bill and of a measure so uncontroversial as the Local Government Bill was that the opposition in those cases consumed three times as much time as had been spent in the discussion of the present Bill. It was purely an arithmetical calculation. The Secretary for the Colonies had often told the Committee that the difference between two and six was only a matter of degree, and, that being so there could be no difference between the three or four days they had taken over this discussion, and the seventeen days which the right hon. Gentleman took to oppose the Bill. Did the right hon. Gentleman think he would gain anything by the continuation of the discussion now? The whole thing turned on the appointment of teachers, and if the right hon. Gentleman would give them that, he (Mr. Lloyd George) was not sure that they would not pass the whole Bill before half-past five.

MR. ELLIOT (Durham), in the interests of the business of the House, deplored the line taken by right hon. Gentlemen opposite. If this appeal was to be taken seriously, and every day half an hour before the time came to close the debate the same appeal was made, there would be no other course open but to adjourn the House whenever they came to the discussion of a new Clause. When they remembered what had been done in this Bill so far, it was enough to make many of them feel a little ashamed of the business capacity of the House. There had been an enormous amount of continual repetition, and there were many in the House who did not wish this everlasting waste of time to go on indefinitely.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he could not see that the right hon. Gentleman opposite had any reason to complain of the progress that had been made with the Bill. Part II of the Bill, which dealt with secondary education, had been passed, and they had dealt with Clause 7, which was certainly one of the most controversial parts of the Bill. That progress was not such as to merit the censure of the right hon. Gentleman. He had no idea when they met that so much progress would have been made in so controversial a portion of the Bill. Therefore he did not think the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman were well founded. He did not think he had ever heard so little frequent speaking by the same person on the same Amendment. Of course in different Amendments it was another matter. Everybody knew what the controversial Clauses of this Bill were. They were Clauses 9 and 10, and then there was Clause 12. But it was not the right attitude to take to deal with this Bill as if very little of the controversial part of it had been obtained. He also thought that the Bill itself was responsible for a great part of the Amendments. The view of the Opposition was that the Bill did not deal with a great many subjects which in an ordinary case would have been dealt with in the Bill. Therefore it was necessary, from their point of view, to supply the omissions. The discussions on the Local Government Bill in 1893, which was not a controversial Bill in the sense that this Bill was, were much more protracted, if he remembered rightly.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.), who spoke amid cries of "Divide," said, as he understood the Leader of the Opposition, the right hon. Gentleman in one breath said that, although he had carefully observed the course of the debates he had not noticed any unnecessary repetition, while in the next breath he said that what had been said in the last half hour would necessarily be repeated next week. He was disposed to think that the second statement was the more accurate. He quite recognised that outside the House, and probably inside the House, there was a fairly large section anxious to destroy the Bill; but he was equally confident that there was a large number of people outside anxious to see the Bill reasonably amended. So far as he could judge, the methods now being pursued would result in the discussion of material Amendments being scamped, while the Committee was wasting time on Amendments which were not necessary, and which the Committee had again and again rejected by preponderating majorities. He believed that progress was not being made by reason of the endless Amendments that were put forward. As one more interested in educational work than in political partisan work, he deprecated the attempt in the Motion before the House to throw away half an hour of valuable time.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I shall not raise any objection to the Motion, Sir. I have no doubt the right hon. Gentleman opposite thinks our progress expeditious, and even headlong.

Question put and agreed to.

Committee report Progress.

To sit again upon Monday next.

AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time upon Tuesday next.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-eight minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 27th October, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

IMPRISONMENT OF A MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following letter relating to the imprisonment of a Member—

"58, Palmerston Road,
"Dublin,
"25th October, 1902.

"SIR,—I beg to inform you that in the hearing of an appeal by James Patrick Farrell, Esq., Member of Parliament for the North Division of Longford, against orders of a Court of Summary Jurisdiction formed pursuant to the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, upon a summons,

"That he, the said James Patrick Farrell, between the 15th July, 1902, and the 8th September, 1902, did, by the publication of certain matter in a certain newspaper, called the *Longford Leader*, in the town of Longford, in the urban district of Longford, same being a proclaimed district under the provisions of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, wrongfully and without legal authority unlawfully use intimidation towards one William Martin, in consequence of the said William Martin having done certain acts which he had a legal right to do, namely, having taken legal proceedings to recover, and for having by such legal proceedings recovered possession of certain lands and premises theretofore occupied by one Patrick Hughes.

"And, further, that he, the said James Patrick Farrell, between the said 15th July 1902, and the 8th day of September, 1902, did, by the publication of certain matter in the said newspaper, called the *Longford Leader*, in the said town of Longford, in the said urban district of Longford, same being a proclaimed district as aforesaid, wrongfully and without legal authority unlawfully incite certain persons, whose names are unknown, unlawfully to use intimidation towards one William Martin in consequence of the said William Martin having done certain acts which he had a legal right to do, namely, having taken legal proceedings to recover, and for having recovered, possession of certain lands and premises theretofore occupied by one Patrick Hughes.

"And, further, that he, the said James Patrick Farrell, between the said 15th day of July, 1902, and the said 8th day of September, 1902, did, by the publication of certain matter in the said newspaper called the *Longford Leader*, in the said town of Longford, in the said urban district of Longford, same being a proclaimed district as aforesaid, wrongfully and without legal authority unlawfully use intimidation towards Patrick M. O'Reilly and other persons whose names are unknown, to wit, persons who had taken, used, or occupied farms of land from which tenants had been evicted in consequence of the said Patrick M. O'Reilly and such other persons as aforesaid having done acts which they had a legal right to do, namely, to take, use, and occupy such farms as aforesaid.

"And further that he, the said James Patrick Farrell, between the said 15th day of July, 1902, and the said 8th day of September, 1902, did, by the publication of certain matter in the said newspaper, called the *Longford Leader*, in the said town of Longford, in the said urban district of Longford, same being a proclaimed district as aforesaid, wrongfully and without legal authority, unlawfully incite certain persons, whose names are unknown, unlawfully to use intimidation towards Patrick M. O'Reilly and other persons, whose names are unknown, to wit, persons who had taken, used, or occupied farms of land from which tenants had been evicted in consequence of the said Patrick M. O'Reilly and such other persons as aforesaid having done acts which they had a legal right to do, namely, to take, use, and occupy such farms as aforesaid.

"And further, that he, the said James Patrick Farrell, between the said 15th day of July, 1902, and the said 8th day of September, 1902, did, by the publication of certain matter in the said newspaper called the *Longford Leader*, in the said urban district of Longford, same being a proclaimed district as aforesaid, wrongfully and without legal authority unlawfully use intimidation towards certain persons whose names are unknown, to wit, persons who had not theretofore joined or become members of a certain society or association commonly called the United Irish League, with a view to cause said persons to do an act which they had a legal right to abstain from doing, namely, to join or become members of the said society or association commonly called the United Irish League.

"I, on the 24th day of October instant, convicted the said James Patrick Farrell, Esq., on the said several five charges, and sentenced him to one calendar month's imprisonment with hard labour on each of the said first four counts.

"And to two calendar months' imprisonment with hard labour on the fifth charge, and at the expiration of that period to find sureties for his good behaviour for twelve calendar months, himself in £50, and two sureties of £25 each, and, in default of finding such sureties, to be imprisoned for a further term of one calendar month, except such recognisance be sooner entered into, each and all said sentences to run concurrently.

"I take the liberty of adding that after I had pronounced sentence, I informed the said James Patrick Farrell, Esq., that if he would promise me to cease publishing in his newspaper, boycotting notices or intimidatory matter, by means of which he was creating a state of terrorism in the county, I should remove the rule of bail and remit so much of the sentence as imposed hard labour.

"This Mr. Farrell point blank refused to do.

"Therefore my sentence as pronounced stood.

"I have the honour to remain, Sir,
"Your obedient servant.
"JOHN ADYE CURRAN,
"County Court Judge and Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the County Longford.

"To The Rt. Hon. William Court Gully, K.C.,
"Speaker of the House of Commons,
"Speaker's House,
"Westminster, S.W."

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

WATER PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

WICK BURGH EXTENSION ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Read a second time; to be considered tomorrow.

LONDON UNITED ELECTRIC RAILWAYS BILL.

MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth): May I ask if the Motion which stands on the Paper, which proposes to substitute the names of promoters of a Bill which has been reported to the House by a Committee as withdrawn, is in order?

*MR. SPEAKER: The first Motion is to recommit the Bill. Does the hon. Member oppose that?

MR. PERKS: Yes.

*MR. SPEAKER: Then the Motion must stand over.

MR. PERKS: On the Instruction, I beg to ask whether it is in order?

*MR. SPEAKER: There is a Motion to recommit the Bill, and that must be dealt with before any question can arise on an Instruction. It can in any case only arise if the Motion to recommit is carried.

MR. PERKS: But is a Motion to recommit the Bill in order when the Bill has already been reported as withdrawn?

*MR. SPEAKER: That was not the hon. Member's question. The hon. Member has taken objection to the Motion, and the matter will now stand over till Wednesday. My impression is that it is not in order, but I understand the hon. Member who set it down desires to call my attention to some precedents.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Stainland; Sowerby Bridge; Hebden Bridge (two); Boldon; Haltwhistle; Wainstalls; Midgley; and Blaenavon; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Todmorden; Hebden Bridge; Leicester; and Stewarton; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Stainland; Hebden Bridge (two); Haltwhistle; Wainstalls; Midgley; Boldon; and Blaenavon; to lie upon the Table.

IMPERIAL DEFENCE SCHEME.

Petition from Baildon, for adoption; to lie upon the Table.

OLD AGE PENSION SCHEME.

Petition from Baildon, for adoption; to lie upon the Table.

PLUMBERS' REGISTRATION BILL.

Petition from Leamington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: from Stainland; Sowerby Bridge; Hebden Bridge (two); Haltwhistle; Boldon; Blaenavon; Wainstalls; and Midgley; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INEBRIATES' REGULATIONS.

Copy presented, of Regulations made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department by virtue of Section 20 of the Inebriates Act, 1898, for carrying into effect the provisions of Section 5 of the Licensing Act, 1902, respecting the detention of Inebriates committed to Retreats [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 361.]

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1902.

Copy presented, of Conference between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Prime Ministers of the Self-governing Colonies, June–August, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL.)

Copy presented, of Colonial Reports, No. 369 (Hong Kong, Annual Report for 1901) [by Command]: to lie upon the Table.

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.

Inquiry into Charities (County of Montgomery), further Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February, 1900; *Mr Grant Lawson*]; to be printed. [No. 362.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Somaliland Operations—Cost.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether any, and, if so, what portion of the cost of the Somali War will be borne by the revenues of India, or will the whole cost be borne by British revenues; do His Majesty's Government propose to submit any estimates and to ask for any grants for the cost of this war; and, if so, when; and, if estimates are to be submitted, will they be submitted as military or as Civil Service Estimates.

(*Answered by Mr Ritchie.*) India has ceased to have any interest in Somaliland, which is a Protectorate under the Foreign Office. The whole cost of the operations against the Mullah will be borne by Somaliland Protectorate funds, supplemented by a grant in aid from Imperial funds. There is already a grant in aid this year of £25,000 under the Protectorates Vote in connection with these military operations; but it is of course probable that before 31st March next an additional grant will be necessary. If so, it would be borne by Civil Estimates like the original grant in aid.

Congo—Arrest of Mr. Rabinek.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, if he can say whether in the Rabinek case the prisoner was taken by the Congolese authorities from a British ship in British waters; and, if so, what course His Majesty's Government propose to adopt.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) It is at present uncertain whether Mr. Rabinek was actually on board a British vessel when arrested, or whether the ship was at the time in British waters. Inquiries are, however, being made, and on receipt of definite information His Majesty's Government will be in a position to consider what action should be taken in the matter.

Waima Arbitration.

MR. C. BILL (Staffordshire, Leek): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the award of the arbitrator in the Waima case has been accepted by the French Government; when the compensation money will be paid; and how will it be distributed.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The French Government have informed His Majesty's Government that the compensation money will be paid as soon as the sanction of the Chamber can be obtained. It is proposed to distribute the amount, £9,000, in the proportion of—£4,000 to the widow and three children of Lieutenant Liston; £2,000 to the mother of Captain Lendy; £2,000 to the mother of Second Lieutenant Wroughton; £1,000 among the families of the non-commissioned officers and men of the West India Regiment and the Sierra Leone Frontier Police who were killed, and among the non-commissioned officers and men of those forces who have sustained permanent injury in consequence of the wounds which they then received. Of course the sums actually distributed in the several cases where advances of the compensation money have already been made will be less than those I have mentioned by the amounts advanced.

Russia and Afghanistan.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will lay upon the Table copies of the communications which have passed between the Russian and British Governments on the subject of the Russian proposal to establish certain relations with Afghanistan.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The matter to which my hon. friend refers is the subject of communications which are still proceeding between the British and Russian Governments. No Papers can be presented at present.

Avoch (Ross-shire) Lights.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether arrangements will be made for the scheme for four lighted buoys and one lighted beacon for marking the channel off Avoch, Ross-shire, to be carried into effect next year.

(*Answered by Mr Gerald Balfour.*) The scheme for lighting the channel off Avoch, Ross-shire, will be considered with other proposals for new works in connection with the Estimates for the next financial year.

Braunton (North Devon) Lighthouse.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will see that the necessary steps are taken in order to provide the money to be expended in connecting Braunton Lighthouse, in North Devon, with the telephone.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I understand that the Post Office authorities have at present no funds available for this purpose, but that the work will be one of the first to be undertaken in the next financial year.

Strangford Lough Lights—Wreck of the "William Bailey."

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will call the attention of the Irish Lights Commissioners to the fact that a steamer, the "William Bailey," has been wrecked near Rock Angus, at the entrance to the Strangford Lough; and whether he is aware that the lighthouse erected thereon sixty years ago is still unprovided with any light or beacon, and is in a dangerous condition; and will he say whether he proposes to take any steps with regard to the constitution of the Irish Light Commission.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I have communicated with the Commissioners of Irish Lights, and am informed by them that the steamer in question was stranded during hazy weather off Tara, which is two miles north of the entrance to Strangford Lough. It would appear that she was not, in fact, endeavouring to enter the Lough. The Commissioners had already informed me that the beacon tower on Rock Angus had never been lighted because it was found useless to vessels seeking shelter without leading lights to guide past the dangers at the entrance of Strangford Lough and up to Audley and Cross Roads anchorages, but that they were not aware that the tower was in a dangerous condition. The reply to the final part of the Question is in the negative.

Case of Typhus Fever at Ness, Lewis.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that the hovel in which a man named Mackay recently died of typhus fever in the district of Ness, Island of Lewis, was unfit for human habitation, will he state why he was allowed by the public health authorities to remain in this insanitary dwelling and thus imperil the public health of this district.

(*Answered by Mr. Graham Murray.*) I am informed that the local medical officer of health is of opinion that the house was unfit for habitation, and should be burnt. In the meantime it is unoccupied, and has been closed. It is for the local authority to consider, in light of all the circumstances as disclosed to them, whether it is better to take steps for a particular patient's removal, or to refrain from doing so.

Sheshader Footpath.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate if he can state when the footpath which is being constructed from the township of Sheshader to Aird School for the use of the ninety children attending the school is likely to be completed.

(*Answered by Mr. Graham Murray.*) The footpath in question is expected to be finished by the end of next month.

Telegraph Learners—Competitive Examinations.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): To ask the Postmaster General if he can state the number of candidates and vacancies for the post of telegraph learner in London in the last open competition at which the prospect of attaining a salary of £190 per annum was held out to the competitors by the Civil Service Commissioners; and also the number of candidates and vacancies for the post of male learner in London in the last open competition, held in 1902, as well as the number of marks obtained by the highest successful competitor in each case and the percentage they represent of the aggregate.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The last open competition for the situation of male telegraph learner in London at which the prospect of attaining a salary of £190 per annum was held out to competitors by the Civil Service Commissioners was held on the 21st January, 1890. On that occasion 415 candidates competed for seventy situations. The first successful candidate obtained 927 marks out of 1,000, or 92·7 per cent. The last open competition for male learner was held on the 1st of August, 1902, when 88 candidates competed for 75 situations. The first successful candidate obtained 1,604 marks out of 1,900, or 84·42 per cent.

Belfast Postal Arrangements.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): To ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been called to the time which elapses between the arrival of the English mail at the General Post Office, Belfast, and the despatch of the letters therefrom for delivery; and whether any steps can be taken to mitigate the inconvenience caused to the public by such delay, especially on Saturdays.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) This matter was already engaging the attention of the responsible officers, and proposals are being prepared for a revision of the outdoor staff, with the view of expediting the delivery as much as possible. The delay in commencing the delivery is frequently due to the late arrival of the mails at Belfast.

Reading Postal Staff.

MR. GEORGE PALMER (Reading): To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that certain learners at the Reading Post Office have been punished by the infliction of extra duty for incorrectly addressing envelopes; and will he state if the course followed on this occasion by the authorities has his approval.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I am aware that certain learners at the Reading Post Office have been punished, as stated, for careless performance of their duties, leading to serious delay in the delivery of telegrams, and to great inconvenience to the public. I see no reason to interfere in the matter.

County Sligo Postal Arrangements.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that, owing to the present postal arrangements, letters delivered in the Kilfree, County Sligo, postal district cannot be replied to the same day, although the post leaves Gurteen, three miles distant, at 5.20 p.m. daily; and whether arrangements can be made by which the rural letter carrier can take the mails in time to meet the evening post leaving Gurteen.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) As I explained, in answer to a similar Question of the hon. Member's in February last, no improvement in the postal service from Kilfree can be effected without additional expense, which, owing to the comparatively high cost of the present service, I should not be justified in incurring.

Leek Post Office.

MR. C. BILL: To ask the Postmaster General whether, considering the amount of accommodation at the present post office at Leek, it is intended to commence the building of the new post office as soon as possible.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The plans for the new post office at Leek are under consideration, but it is impossible to state at present when the building will be commenced.

Muzzling Order in Carmarthenshire.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he is now in a position to state when he hopes to be able to withdraw the Muzzling Order which is in force in the County of Carmarthen.

(*Answered by Mr. Hanbury.*) The position of Carmarthenshire in regard to rabies is much more satisfactory than it was, no case of the disease having been reported since the 6th May last. I hope, therefore, that it may be possible for me, if no further outbreak occurs, to withdraw the Order at no very distant date; but as the hon. Member himself pointed out in Committee of Supply, Muzzling Orders have not hitherto been attended with the same success in this county as elsewhere, such Orders having had to be re-imposed on three separate occasions, shortly after their withdrawal. I am very anxious to take every precaution to avoid a similar occurrence on the present occasion, and to be quite satisfied that the Orders have done their work.

Adulteration of Dairy Products—Proposed International Conference.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether the Board of Agriculture has invited the Belgian or any Governments to a conference on the subject of the adulteration of dairy products, with the view of preventing such adulteration.

(*Answered by Mr. Hanbury.*) No such invitation as that referred to has been issued. A resolution was adopted at a conference held in April last, under the auspices of the National Dairy Society of Belgium, calling on the Belgian Government to submit to the Governments of the various foreign countries interested in the butter industry a proposal to appoint an International Conference with a view to adopt some common basis of legislation as a means to prevent the exportation of adulterated butter, but, so far as I am aware, no official action has as yet been taken in this direction.

Somaliland Operations — Hospital Arrangements at Aden.

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India, what hospital accommodation and number of nurses are available at Aden for European officers and native troops engaged in Somaliland.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The hospital accommodation at Aden for native troops consists of seventy-eight beds, of which forty are vacant, and more could probably be arranged for. A native field hospital is about to be sent there immediately. European officers can be accommodated at the Station Hospital, where there are two European nurses.

Indian Universities Commission Report.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been directed to the Report of the Indian Universities Commission; whether any educational policy that may be founded upon the Report will be carried into effect by resolution of the Government of India or by legislation; and whether, before giving his sanction to any such policy, he will give the House of Commons an opportunity of discussing the matter.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) I have seen the Report of the Indian Universities Commission, which has been referred to the local governments for their opinions. When these opinions have been obtained by the Government of India the Report will be further considered, but at present it is premature to attempt to anticipate the form in which the policy that may be adopted will be announced. Nor can I undertake that before that policy is adopted it will be submitted for discussion in the House of Commons.

MR. CAINE: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that at one time the only law college in Bengal was in connection with the Presidency College; that, on the affiliation of the other law classes, students left the Presidency College for those classes, where the fees were lower; and that the Government thereupon abolished the Presidency College classes in law; and, whether it is now proposed to revive the Presidency College classes in law and to abolish the affiliated classes.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The proposal referred to in the Question is contained in the Report of the Indian Universities Commission (paragraphs 121 and 122). As I have said, in answer to the preceding Question, I understand that the Government of India have not yet arrived at any conclusion on the subject.

MR. CAINE: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the recommendations of the Indian Universities Commission, and to the proposed closing of local law classes; and whether he will protect the interests of the poorer students from suffering through increase of fees.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) I beg to refer the hon. Member to my answer to the last Question but one. The matter referred to will not be lost sight of by the Government of India, who, I am confident, will take due account of the interests of the poorer students.

Rosslare Railway Company—Damage to Roads in South Wexford.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that some of the roads in South Wexford have become almost impassable owing to the damage that has been done by traction engines hauling materials for the Rosslare Railway Company; and whether he will endeavour by legislation or otherwise to compel the owners of traction engines in all such cases either to repair the damage or contribute to the upkeep of the roads.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Representations have been made to the effect stated in the first part of the Question. Legislation would be necessary to confer on local authorities in Ireland powers analogous to those conferred on local authorities in England in recovering damages for excessive wear of highways by reason of extraordinary traffic. The question of legislating for Ireland in this direction is under consideration.

Promotion Claims of Re-employed and Reserve Officers.

COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the claims to promotion of re-employed and reserve officers of Regiments and Departments who have been serving at home during the late war in South Africa, and whose services are still being utilised.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Among the re-employed and reserve officers whose promotions were gazetted on the 17th instant the names of some who are still employed will be found. Should further cases arise of such officers who had not then completed the qualifying service of eighteen months' re-employment at home and who are recommended for promotion, they will be duly considered.

Army Hair Brushes.

MR. SOARES: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that hair brushes are distributed free to the Cavalry but not to the Infantry; and will he explain the reason of the distinction.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) If the hon. Member will kindly refer to Army Order 244 of October 1902, he will find that the issue of a hair brush has been sanctioned for each soldier of the Foot Guards, Infantry of the Line, and Royal Army Medical Corps.

South African War—Transport—Overcrowding on the "Drayton Grange."

MR. H. C. RICHARDS: To ask the Secretary of State for War when the evidence and report of the inquiry as to the lack of medical stores and dangerous overcrowding on the "Drayton Grange" will be laid upon the Table of the House of Commons; and whether he will state what action he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The report has not yet reached the War Office.

Hong Kong Post Office.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in view of the fact that a site for a new post office at Hong Kong has been purchased, will he state when it is proposed to proceed with the construction of the building.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) Designs for the new buildings were to have been invited locally, but the calling for designs was postponed pending the Secretary of State's decision as to the proposals for providing quarters for the Chinese Post Office staff on the existing post office site, which involved an alteration in the conditions on which the purchase of the site for the new post office was sanctioned. The Secretary of State's decision was given in a despatch of 4th September, so the Governor has got it by now, and will no doubt call for designs.

Sierra Leone Government Steam Launch.

MR. MOON: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether the steam launch recently provided for the Sierra Leone Government at a cost of £4,805 has since been sold for less than half its cost.

(*Answered by Mr Secretary Chamberlain.*) There is no foundation for the statement that the launch recently provided for the Sierra Leone Government, at a cost of £4,805. has since been sold for less than half its cost.

Secondee Pier.

MR. MOON: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any official reports showing that no steamers, but only small lighters at low water, are able to use the pier at Secondee recently completed at the cost of £26,887, and whether a crane at the end of the pier is so built that it cannot lift boilers or other heavy pieces of railway material on to the trucks on the pier; and will he say by whose advice a pier was constructed where it is.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) The pier at Secondee was constructed for the use of small steamers and lighters whose draught does not exceed five feet, and such vessels are able to use it. There are four cranes on the pier, three of which can now and always could lift boilers or other heavy articles up to four tons in weight, direct into trucks; and the fourth crane (a ten-ton one), which could originally only lift boilers or other articles of exceptional bulk on to the deck of the pier, has since been raised five feet, thus enabling it to lift them on to the trucks. The pier was constructed where it is by the advice of Messrs. Coode, Son, and Matthews, the well-known engineers.

Cirencester Board School and Voluntary Schools.

SIR CHARLES DILKE: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether his attention has been directed to the case of some children who, having been attending a Church school and having been taken away from that school, their parents being dissatisfied with it, were refused admission to the Cirencester board schools; and, seeing that after the refusal of the School Board to admit the children the parents were fined for neglecting to send their children to school, can he state the grounds on which admission was refused by the School Board, and whether in such cases regard can be had to the wishes of the parents in respect of the training of their children.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) Three children, named Godsell, were removed by their parents from the Cirencester, Watermoor Trinity National School, and were refused admission to the Cirencester, Lewis Lane, Board School, in or about May last. An arrangement existed between the School Board and the managers of voluntary schools in the town forbidding capricious migration of children from school to school. Such arrangements are not uncommon, and they are recognised by the Board of Education as an aid to continuity of teaching. Complaints arising under Article 78 of the Code are dealt with by the Board of Education on their merits. In the present case the parents complained of "unkindness" to the children at the Watermoor School, but sent no reply to a request of the Board of Education that they would specify some instances of unkindness. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the School Board interviewed both parents and children, and were satisfied that the complaint was groundless. The Board of Education thereupon supported the School Board in their exclusion of the children as "reasonable" (Article 78).

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

Repatriation of Boer Prisoners.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what number of those who were prisoners of war at the signing of the terms of peace in South Africa have been sent back to their homes, what number still remain at the places where they were confined, what are the numbers and places respectively, and what arrangements have been made for the return of these.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The number of prisoners of war repatriated or *en route* is about 13,000. The numbers remaining are—at St. Helena, about 200; at Bermuda, about 400; in Ceylon, 2,800; and in Indian camps, 6,200. Arrangements have been made for bringing back 7,000 of those in Ceylon and India before the end of the year, and the remainder can be sent back very soon afterwards if they have declared allegiance.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with reference to the fund of £3,000,000 granted for re-stocking and reinstating Boers on their farms, whether any portion of that sum has been employed in the travelling expenses of the repatriation of the Boer prisoners.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The answer is in the negative. The cost of bringing the Boer prisoners back to the new colonies falls upon Army funds.

MR. PIRIE: To what use is the fund known as the Repatriation Fund put in South Africa?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not know to what fund the hon. Member refers. I do not know that any fund is specially called the Repatriation Fund.

MR. PIRIE: The fund on which cheques are drawn for repatriation purposes. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will inquire.

Woolwich Arsenal Paymaster and Collection of Income Tax.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the advisability of making arrangements so that Colonel A. B. Williams, now acting as paymaster at the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, should not also act as assessor and collector of income duty for the establishment.

LORD STANLEY: Under the present procedure the paymaster supplies the surveyor of taxes with information as to the wages of the men whose earnings render them liable to income duty, and collects from them the amounts that official states to be due. The money is not deducted from the men's wages, but voluntarily paid to the paymaster. There appears to be no reason whatever for altering this procedure, nor does the hon. Member offer any.

H.M.S. "Montagu"—Trial Trip.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if His Majesty's battleship "Montagu" has had a trial trip, and if he will state what have been the results, and the condition of the Belleville water-tube boilers after the run.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The results of the trial trip of the "Montagu" have been unsatisfactory. There was considerable leakage from the joints of sleeves in the boilers, and a number of the lead plugs in the generator tubes blew out, owing to their being incorrectly fitted. The sleeves and plugs are being replaced, and it is anticipated that no further trouble will arise.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: May I ask who bears the expense of repairs to this new battleship under these circumstances?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The contractors for the engines.

Somaliland Operations—Cost—Financial Obligations of India in matters Imperial.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if any action has been taken between the Imperial and the Indian Governments with regard to the recommendations contained in paragraph 360 of the Report of the Indian Expenditure Commission, urging that His Majesty's Government on the one hand and on the other hand the Secretary of State in Council, after consultation with the Government of India, should draw a Treasury Minute authoritatively settling the extent to which India has a direct and substantial interest in certain clearly-defined areas of the Empire outside the boundaries of British India; has such a Minute been prepared and authorised; and, if so, will it be made public.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for India if India is to be held to have any direct or substantial interest in Somaliland; and, if so, to what extent; and will any portion of the cost of the present expedition against the Mullah be chargeable upon Indian Revenues, and to what extent.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): Perhaps I may be allowed to answer these two Questions together. If the hon. Gentleman will refer to pages fourteen to seventeen of the Parliamentary Paper, No. 169, which was ordered by this House to be printed in May last, he will see that an agreement has been arrived at as to the matters to which his Question relates, but that it was decided to ratify it by publishing the correspondence on the subject between the Treasury and the India Office, rather than by the drafting of a Treasury minute. He will also see that, under this agreement, the Government of India are not to be regarded as having any direct or substantial interest in the scene of the present operations in Somaliland. Accordingly, no portion of the cost of those operations will be chargeable to Indian Revenues.

Coronation Medals.

MR. GEORGE FABER (York): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Coronation medals are all, or any of them, dated 26th June, 1902; and, if so, why, when the date of the Coronation was altered, the date on the medals was not also altered before their issue.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): It should be remembered that these medals are the personal gift of the King, and that no Government Department is responsible for them. But it is not, I think, difficult to understand the reasons why the date 26th June appears on the medals. They were got ready for that date, and to alter them would have taken a long time counting from the date on which the Coronation actually took place, so that they would not have been ready for distribution. Further, it would have cost a considerable sum of money to re-make them, and in all the circumstances to incur further expense in the matter may well have seemed unjustifiable.

Alterations in the Prayer Book.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that, in a recent edition of the "Book of Common Prayer," the King's printers have made certain alterations from the authorised text, and will he state by whose authority they were made.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: The alterations referred to by my hon. friend raise questions of very great importance and complexity, and involve a long answer, which with the permission of the hon. Member I propose to circulate with the Parliamentary Papers.

Local Loans—Term of Repayment.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he proposes to act upon and carry out the report of the Select Committee on the Term of Repayment of Loans, especially in relation to loans in respect of the better housing of the people; and, if so, when he will introduce legislation for the purpose; or whether the Local Government Board propose to act upon the recommendations in the report as a matter of Departmental administration.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): Legislation would be necessary to give effect to some of the recommendations of the Committee, particularly in relation to loans for purposes of the Housing of the Working Classes Acts. It would not be practicable to legislate on the subject during the present Session; but I have the Report of the Committee now under consideration, and I hope shortly to arrive at a decision with regard to the proposals in it so far as administrative action is concerned.

Motor Car Regulations.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will next session introduce and press forward a Bill to place the law respecting motor cars on a more satisfactory footing, by removing the present hard and fast limit as to speed, by requiring registration, by making the use of public roads by these vehicles subject to respect for the rights, convenience, and safety of all other users thereof, and by enacting a heavy maximum penalty for breaches of these conditions.

MR. WALTER LONG: In May last, in the debate on the vote for the Local Government Board, I indicated the general lines on which amendment of the law as to motor cars should, as it seemed to me, proceed; but I pointed out that there were considerable difficulties in the way of a settlement of the question. I cannot at the present time give any pledge as to legislative proposals for next session; but it will be a matter of satisfaction to me if I find it practicable to deal with the matter then.

Alien Immigration Commission.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has received the Report of the Royal Commission upon Alien Immigration, which was appointed several months ago; and, if not, when he expects to be in possession thereof, or if an instalment of the evidence taken will be laid upon the Table.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The Royal Commission has not yet made a Report, and I cannot say when it is likely to do so, but I have no doubt its proceedings are being conducted with all necessary despatch.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the pressing nature of this matter, seeing that over 60,000 aliens have come into this country this year?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have no control over the proceedings of the Royal Commission.

Underground Telegraph Wires—Wireless Telegraphy.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he will state how far underground wires have now been extended in the direction of Scotland; and whether, in the event of another breakdown of overhead telegraph wires, he will arrange for communication being maintained by Marconi's wireless system.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): Pipes and wires have been laid as far as Warrington, and nearly fifty miles of pipes have been put down between Preston and Shap, beyond which point the work has not yet extended. I am afraid that at present the Department could not obtain useful assistance from the Marconi wireless system in such an emergency as that to which the hon. Member refers.

Open Competitions for the Telegraph Service.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Postmaster General if he can state the number of candidates and vacancies for the post of telegraph learner in London in the last open competition, at which the prospect of attaining a salary of £190 per annum was held out to the competitors by the Civil Service Commissioners; and also the number of candidates and vacancies for the post of male learner in London in the last open competition held in 1902, as well as the number of marks obtained by the highest successful competitor in each case and the percentage they represent of the aggregate.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The last open competition for the situation of male telegraph learner in London at which the prospect of attaining a salary of £190 per annum was held out to competitors by the Civil Service Commissioners was held on the 21st January, 1890. On that occasion 415 candidates competed for 70 situations. The first successful candidate obtained 927 marks out of 1,000, or 92·7 per cent.

The last open competition for male learners was held on the 1st August, 1902, when 88 candidates competed for 75 situations. The first successful candidate obtained 1,604 marks out of 1,900, or 84·42 per cent.

Conviction of a Metropolitan Policeman for Perjury.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether he will cause to have laid upon the Table of the House copies of the shorthand writer's report of the trial of Police Constable Rolls in the Central Criminal Court, London.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): There is no intention of doing that. The hon. Member will find the evidence in the records of the Central Criminal Court published this month.

MR. CULLINAN: Was a special note-taker employed in this case?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I cannot say.

Glasgow Rectorial Election Disturbances.

MR. FLYNN (Cork Co., N.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether his attention has been called to the serious rioting and disturbances in connection with the rectorial election campaign in Glasgow, and to the fact that an attack was made on the Liberal Committee by the supporters of the opposing candidate, and that police constables were injured; will he say whether any arrests were made in connection with these disturbances; and whether adequate precautions for the protection of life and property during the progress of these rectorial contests in Scotland will be taken by the authorities.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): Inquiry has been made into the occurrences at Glasgow referred to by the hon. Member, and I am informed that they cannot be described as serious, that both political parties among the students have taken part in them, that one policeman was slightly injured but not, it is believed, by the act of a student, that no arrests have been made, that no damage has been done to property other than that belonging to the students, and that the assaults on party head-quarters have been carried out in perfect good-humour, and have usually been the prelude to a united smoking concert. The Chief Constable has taken adequate precautions for the protection of life and property, and, in these circumstances, I am not prepared to recommend any exceptional measures for the suppression of disorder.

MR. FLYNN: Is it because the students are supporters of the Chief Secretary that no action will be taken?

No answer was returned.

Eligibility of Women under the Education Bill.

MR. PLUMMER (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the Secretary of the Board of Education whether, with a view of making plain the position of women in the work of public education in the future, he will state in what capacities under the provisions of the Education Bill they will be enabled to act.

*THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Cambridge University): Under the Education Bill, women will be eligible for the Boards of Managers of public elementary schools. They will also be eligible for places on the Education Committee of the Local Education Authority. This is plain from the terms of the Bill. It has always been the declared intention of the Government. I may refer the hon. Member to an answer given by the First Lord of the Treasury to a Question in this House on the 10th of April of this year.†

Meetings on Belfast Custom House Steps—Collections.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will take steps to prohibit the collection of money at the political meetings held every Sunday on Government property in Belfast; and whether he will consult the First Commissioner of Works as to the regulations at present in force in that respect in Hyde Park, London.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cv., 1456.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The collection of money in Hyde Park is prohibited by Statute. I have no power to act as suggested, and do not propose to introduce legislation.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Is it not the fact that the First Commissioner of Works of the last ten years has made regulations prohibiting the collection of money in Hyde Park, and has not the right hon. Gentleman similar power with regard to Government property in Ireland?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have said not. The collection in Hyde Park is prohibited under the Parks Regulation Act, 1872.

Sergeant Sullivan, R.I.C.—Evidence of Mr. W. P. Nolan.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, as President of the Local Government Board of Ireland, whether he has called upon Mr. W. P. Nolan, as one of the clerks of that Board, and as the handwriting expert of the Government in Ireland, for a statement as to the authorship of the forged letter attributed to Sergeant Sullivan; and, if so, whether Mr. Nolan's Report will be communicated to the House.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first part of this Question is in the negative.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how often and for how many days Mr. T. P. Nolan has been absent from his duties in the Local Government Board Office, Dublin, for the purpose of working or giving evidence as a handwriting expert; whether he can state what official permitted him to absent himself to give evidence on behalf of Sergeant Sullivan or in other cases in which the Irish Government were interested; what remuneration he received from all sources in each case; and whether any deduction was made from his salary as a Government official by reason of his absence from duty.

MR. WYNDHAM: No special leave was given to Mr. Nolan for the purpose of engaging in this work or of attending to give evidence. He applied for and obtained leave of absence from the Vice-President of the Board in the ordinary way, from time to time. No deduction from his salary was made when he was on leave of absence. The payments made to him in respect of his employment as a handwriting expert were as follows:—£21 16s. 7d., £19 12s. 4d., £19 17s. 3d., £10 12s., £5 5s., £28 8s. 2d.; total, £105 11s. 4d.

Closing of Irish Prisons.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the number of prosecutions and convictions in Ireland under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, it is intended to re-open the five prisons in Ireland which were closed as unnecessary last December on the order of the General Prisons Board.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is not proposed to re-open any of the prisons referred to.

Belfast Orange Institution.

MR. DEVLIN (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the hon. Member for South Belfast and Mr. Samuel Boal of Belfast have been summoned to appear before a court of the Orange Institution, with the object of compelling them to adopt a certain course of action; whether he intends to proceed against the persons concerned, under the provisions of The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887; and whether he intends to proclaim the local Orange body as an illegal association.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to this Question is in the negative.

The Proclamation of the City of Dublin.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland why the city of Dublin was proclaimed under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act.

* Mr. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers the Question—["Order, order!" from the Nationalist Benches]. You are not going to bully me!

* Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member has risen to put another Question. That is sometimes done, and it may be in order, but I must first hear the Question.

* Mr. TULLY: The Question I wish to ask is whether without this proclamation the right hon. Gentleman could deal with the real offenders as a case of trading under false pretences?

* Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. WYNDHAM: The City of Dublin was proclaimed because the Government was advised that a newspaper published there, called the *Irish People*, had for some weeks contained illegal and criminal matter.

* Mr. TULLY: Now will the right hon. Gentleman answer my Question, Does not this paper falsely purport to be edited by Mr. William O'Brien, and has not the hon. Member publicly repudiated it? That's false pretences.

* Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Police Supervision—Case of Pat Meany, Quinn.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that two members of the Royal Irish Constabulary, in uniform, have continually followed Pat Meany, of Quinn, since August last to fairs in Clare, Limerick, and Tipperary, to the fair of Croom on the 1st of September, Ballysanders, and Newcastle West 1st October, Tipperary Town 10th October, to Ennis 14th October, and that they are constantly following him; and will he state the reason for this action by the police.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The facts are correctly stated in the Question. The movements of this man are under police supervision because he is suspected of illegal practice.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is a formal charge to be made against this man?

Mr. WYNDHAM: If the evidence justifies it a criminal prosecution will be instituted, and prior to doing that, enquiries must be made.

Hard Labour Sentences in Ireland.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has observed that Mr. Samuel P. Harris, who was sentenced by Messrs. Horne and Kelly, resident magistrates, to three months imprisonment with hard labour and an additional term of three months in default of giving bail, for a speech at a public meeting, was described by counsel for the Crown as a Protestant gentleman of the highest respectability; and, seeing that if this sentence had been confirmed it would have disqualified Mr. Harris for membership of the District Council of which he is a member, and that County Court Judge Adams declared that he did not want to add to the sentence any unnecessary degradation, and ordered Mr. Harris to be treated as a first class misdemeanant, whether a copy of Judge Adams's judgment will be furnished to the resident magistrates of Ireland.

Mr. WYNDHAM: It has been the rule to furnish resident magistrates with the authorised judgments of the Superior Courts on questions of law arising upon the administration of the Crimes Act. In this case County Court Judge Adams gave his reasons for altering the punishment awarded by the magistrates. It is obvious that his observations on this subject, which have been published in the Metropolitan and local Press, do not fall within the rule, and it is not proposed to circulate them in the manner suggested.

* Mr. TULLY: May I ask whether Removable Kelly, who gave this harsh sentence, was one of the noble band of patriots of the *Freeman's Journal*.

* Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! I shall have to take strong measures if the hon. Member persists.

*Mr. TULLY: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake not to draw any more removables from the staff of the *Freeman's Journal*?

Goods Rates on Irish Railways.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the freight rate charged on goods from Listowel via Waterford to Liverpool is 30s. per ton, while from Newcastle West by the same route, twenty-four miles less land carriage, it is 32s. 6d. per ton; and that the freight from Newcastle West to Limerick is 6s. 3d. per ton, and from Limerick to Liverpool 25s. per ton, so that the railway company charges 1s. 3d. per ton less for taking in and delivering out goods twice than they do for doing so only once; and will the attention of the Department of Agriculture be called to the matter with the view of facilitating the transit of Irish produce to the English market.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Department has been in correspondence with the Railway Company in this matter, and has been informed that an exceptional rate of 30s. per ton for butter in casks, boxes, etc., from Newcastle West to Liverpool, via Waterford, has been issued.

Irish Congested Districts Board Expenditure.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant a Return dealing with the expenditure of the Congested Districts Board for Ireland during the eleven years of its existence as distributed over counties scheduled.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am prepared to give a Return, but it may not be possible to give it in the precise form desired by the hon. Member.† Perhaps he will be good enough to repeat the Question on Thursday next.

Kerry Fisheries—Coomenaum Slip.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board for Ireland asked the County Council of Kerry to get their surveyor an estimate of the cost of a slip at Coomenaum, Cahirciveen; whether they objected to his first estimate as too large; whether, when he again sent in an estimate, they objected as being too small; and what steps do they now propose taking with regard to this matter.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Two schemes were submitted. The first was considered impracticable, the second unsuitable. I informed the hon. Member on Thursday last that questions dealing with the further expenditure of moneys on works of this character can only be decided after a careful consideration of the whole matter.

Hard Labour Sentences under the Crimes Act—Suggested Government Instructions to Resident Magistrates.

Mr. ARCHDALE (Fermanagh, N.): On behalf of the hon. Member for Mid. Armagh, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Under Secretary, Sir David Harrel, has given instructions to resident magistrates on the subject of the sentences, or form of sentences, imposed by them in cases brought before them under the provisions of The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887.

---

† The Return on the Paper was as follows:—Expenditure in Congested Counties (Ireland),—Return giving Expenditure in the various counties scheduled as congested in Ireland, up to the 31st day of March 1901, in the following form:—

Counties.	Estates purchased.	Estates improved.	Marine works.	Inland works.	Technical instruction.	Parish Committees.	Planting and fruit growing.	Industrial free grants.	Industrial loans.	Loans for purchase of boats and gear.	Free grants of boats and gear.	Instruction in boat-building, fish-curing, net-making.

MR. WYNDHAM: Neither directly nor indirectly, verbally or in writing, has the Under Secretary, or any other person connected with the Government, or, so far as I am aware, any person unconnected with the Government, ever suggested to any resident magistrate or magistrates what sentence or form of sentence they should impose in cases brought before them under the Crimes Act before, during, or after the hearing of such cases. I desire in the strongest way to resent the suggestion that the resident magistrates in Ireland, in the discharge of their oath-bound duties would be influenced by any consideration, save what they, to the best of their ability, conceive to be the merits and justice of the case before them.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he can explain the remarkable unanimity with which the magistrates on a particular day began to give hard labour sentences to those whom they tried for political offences.

MR. WYNDHAM: The explanation for which the hon. Gentleman asks is, I think, contained in the answer I have already given—namely, that these magistrates passed sentences in accordance with their views of the justice and merits of the cases brought before them.

MR. TULLY: What instructions did the right hon. Gentleman give in my case when they sent me to gaol?

Irish Executions.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether, under the new rules for regulating the executions of capital sentences in Ireland, the executioner is bound to be detained in the prison, or its neighbourhood, until the coroner has decided whether he requires him to give evidence at the inquest; and, if so, who has the power to detain him pending the decision of the coroner.

MR. WYNDHAM: The new rules require that the executioner shall remain in the prison until he has completed the execution and until permission is given to him to leave. His detention after the execution would be a matter for arrangement between the sheriff, or his representative, and the governor of the prison.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: But will the coroner's request be recognised by the Governor or sheriff?

MR. WYNDHAM: It is a matter, I think, for the governor of the prison. The questions the coroner has to decide are as to the identity of the body and whether the judgment of death was duly executed. It may be that in the opinion of the governor there is ample evidence available from persons other than the excutioner, whose attendance at the execution is a statutory obligation.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in the case of Dr. Cross, alleged to have been executed in Cork gaol——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Member must put that Question down on the Paper.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I have put it down several times.

MR. SPEAKER: That is a good reason why it should not be put again.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: When I put the Question before I was told that under the prison rule there was no power to detain the executioner. Now the rules are being altered.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is asking as to a specific case, and he must put his Question down.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I submit, Sir, it is in order to ask if the right hon. Gentleman is aware that in the case of Dr. Cross, alleged to have been executed——

MR. SPEAKER: If a Question relates to a particular case, notice must be given.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I will try to put the Question down. I want a satisfactory answer.

Sergeant Sullivan, R.I.C.—Supposed Promotion since his Trial.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether Sergeant Sullivan, who was tried for perjury in the West of Ireland, and who is now stationed in Dunshaughlin, county Meath, got any step in promotion in the rank of sergeants since he was tried for perjury; and whether his removal to a station of the class of Dunshaughlin, which is the headquarters of a district inspector, constitutes promotion in the Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. WYNDHAM: The charge on which Sergeant Sullivan was prosecuted at the Sligo Winter Assizes of 1898, and on which he was acquitted, was, in popular language, for having written a letter inciting to crime. The answer to the remainder of the Question is in the negative.

Irish Prison Warders—Hours of Duty.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he will be prepared to extend the scope of the proposed inquiry into the prison system in Ireland so as to include the number of hours of duty of the prison warders in the local prisons as compared with the system prevailing in English gaols.

MR. WYNDHAM: A sworn inquiry will be held into the special circumstances of Limerick prison and the treatment of Mr. Flanagan. But it is not proposed to hold a general inquiry into the Irish prison system.

Labourers' Cottages Scheme in Cork Rural District.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork Co., Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the grounds on which the Local Government Board refuses to sanction the present scheme of cottages promoted by the Cork Rural District Council, and the matters which require arrangement between the Local Government Board and the District Council.

MR. WYNDHAM: It was proved that the occupants of sixteen cottages were not agricultural labourers. The issue of the Provisional Order is deferred until the District Council has considered these cases, and to what extent the scheme should be modified accordingly.

Constitution of Crimes Act Courts—Mr. Harrel, R.M.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that Sir David Harrel, the Under Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, who advises the Government in the institution of proceedings under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, selects the resident magistrates for the constitution from time to time of the Courts under this Act, will he state how many times and in what cases has Mr. Harrel, resident magistrate, been instructed by Sir David Harrel to attend, as one of its members, a Crimes Court.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Under Secretary, Sir David Harrel, does not advise the Government in the institution of proceedings under the Crimes Act. Such proceedings are instituted upon the advice of the law officers of the Crown. The orders for the constitution of Courts are given by the Under Secretary in the discharge of the duty of his office. Resident magistrates are detailed for duty at these Courts in accordance with the ordinary necessities of the public service. Particulars of the several Courts attended by Mr. Harrel were given in my reply to the hon. Member's Question of the 7th July.† He has not since acted in any fresh case. On each occasion he adjudicated within his proper jurisdiction, in a district to which he had been appointed long before the institution of proceedings under the Crimes Act.

Sergeant Anderson, R.I.C.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what is the precise character of the duties at present discharged by Constable Anderson at the depôt of the Royal Irish Constabulary in the Phœnix Park; and what measures, if any, have been taken to secure that Constable Anderson will be protected in the performance of his duties.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cx., 918.

MR. WYNDHAM: The constable performs the usual routine duties at the depôt, such as guard, fatigue duty, and drill. He does not require protection in the performance of his duties.

McCloskey *v.* Holmes.

MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether an action now pending in the King's Bench Division, Dublin, at the suit of Thomas McCloskey against District Inspector Holmes, R.I.C., for arrest and false imprisonment is being defended at the public expense; and, if so, upon what grounds; having regard to the fact that the charge in respect of which the arrest and false imprisonment took place was dismissed by a full bench of magistrates at the Strabane Petty Sessions, on Monday 29th September, the Chairman in dismissing the charge added that the Bench were of opinion the case was one which should not have been brought into Court.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first inquiry is in the negative. I may add that when such proceedings are taken, if the public officer is successful in vindicating his character, the question of defraying his expenses arises, but not before that.

Agrarian Crime in Queen's County.

MR. DELANY (Queen's Co., Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the last quarterly Return of agrarian outrages in Ireland shows that no offence was committed in Queen's County during the three months preceding the 30th June last, that the Return for the quarter ending 31st March, 1902, shows a similar blank, and that the Chairman of the County Council, and seventeen other local magistrates have protested against the proclamation of the county, he will state upon whose recommendation the county was proclaimed, and when he proposes to withdraw it.

MR. WYNDHAM: The proclamation was issued by the Executive Government after consultation with the officers locally responsible to Government for the maintenance of the public peace. I stated on Monday last that five agrarian outrages had been committed in the county since 30th June, and that it was not at present proposed to withdraw the proclamation.

Arrest of Mr. Reddy, M.P.—Communication of Arrests to the Speaker.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the hon. Member for Birr Division of King's County was arrested under a warrant signed by Major Dease, R.M., and Mr. Newel, R.M., and detained in prison awaiting trial from the 14th to the 23rd September last; and will he say whether any intimation of his arrest was made to the Irish Government, and if any instructions on this subject have been issued by the Irish Executive to the resident magistrates in Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: I stated on Monday last that this hon. Member, having failed to appear in answer to the summons served upon him, was arrested on the warrant of a resident magistrate. He refused to give bail for his appearance at the hearing of the case, and was remanded in custody from the 13th to the 23rd September. These facts were duly notified to Government. I also stated on Thursday last that I had directed general instructions to be sent to resident magistrates requesting them to notify to Mr. Speaker the committal to prison of a Member of this House, or his arrest and remand, whether on bail or in custody.

Public Meetings in Irish Court Houses.

MR. POWER (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Sir William Paul, Baronet, recently convened, at the suggestion of the Lord Lieutenant of the county, a meeting of magistrates at the Court-house, Waterford, to consider the licensing question; and that the High Sheriff of the County Mayo recently expelled from the Court-house, Castlebar, the county councillors of that county who had assembled for the transaction of county business, and who, on its conclusion, proposed presenting an address of thanks to the hon. Member for Cork City for his efforts in connection with the redistribution of land among the small farmers of the county; has the High Sheriff of a county in Ireland the right of attending meetings of County Councils, and the power to decide what matters may be considered by the County Council; and, seeing that the Court-houses are maintained by the rates levied by the County Council, will he take steps to secure to the elected representatives of the ratepayers the same right as non-elected bodies to the use of Court-houses.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no knowledge of the meeting referred to in the first part of the Question. The High Sheriff of Mayo did not recently expel the county councillors of Mayo from the Court-house at Castlebar. He informed them that they should be allowed to use the Court-house for the transaction of their duties, but that he would not permit it to be used for the purpose of a political demonstration. The councillors thereupon quietly withdrew. The intention to hold a demonstration of this character in the Court-house was announced in the Metropolitan and local Nationalist press. The custody and control of the Court-house is vested in the High Sheriff by virtue of his office.

M'Hale v. Sullivan.

MR. CULLINAN: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he will be willing to lay upon the Table of the House copies of the shorthand-writer's report of the civil action in the case of M'Hale v. Sullivan, tried in the Fours Courts, Dublin.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The Crown have no report of the nature mentioned. It is, I believe, contrary to precedent to lay such a Report upon the Table of the House.

Cloonacool Excise Prosecution.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that a farmer named Patrick Henry, of Cloonacool, county Sligo, was prosecuted at the Petty Sessions Court of Tubbercurry on the 6th February, 1902, for carrying a shot-gun without an Excise licence; that the case against Henry was unanimously dismissed by the magistrates; and that on appeal the finding of the Court below was unanimously upheld by Judge O'Connor Morris and his colleagues on the Bench; and whether, seeing that this poor man has been put to expense in having to defend these actions, steps will be taken to have his expenses refunded.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): A similar Question on the same subject was answered by my predecessor on the 2nd of July last,† and I see nothing to alter in or add to that answer.

MR. O'DOWD: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Board of Revenue have already refunded 10s. of this man's expenses, and will he reconsider the matter, seeing that this man was the victim of a bogus prosecution, and compassionate allowances are given to the criminals of the Sergeant Sheridan type?

No answer was returned.

Inch Strand, Co. Kerry—Foreshore Rights.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the farmers residing near Inch Strand, county Kerry, have recently been prevented from taking sand and seaweed there, though during the last 100 years there was no prevention; and seeing that this will prevent many farmers from manuring their land and cause them serious loss, will he have a local public inquiry with the object of deciding the high-water mark.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Board of Trade have received complaints that the owner of the adjoining land has erected posts upon the beach which are said to interfere with the use of the foreshore at Inch Strand. Inquiry is now being made as to whether these posts are above or below the line of high-water mark of ordinary tides. When this has been ascertained the

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cx., 533.

Board will be in a position to decide whether they can take any steps in the matter.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Will the inquiry be a public one?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I do not know that there is any necessity for a public inquiry.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: There is every necessity.

Limerick Post Office.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, in view of the result of the recent inquiry into the administration of the Limerick Post Office, he will consider the advisability of reviewing the circumstances attending the punishment meted out to the staff at that office; and whether, when the punishments were being imposed, the conditions under which the staff performed their duties were taken into account; and whether he will explain why the official safe is placed in its present custody.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: When any punishment is inflicted all the circumstances are taken into consideration, and it does not appear from the enquiry into the Limerick office that there has been any punishment inflicted there which needs reviewing. The official safe is placed in its present custody because the officer who usually takes charge of it is absent on leave.

Irish County Court Judges.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether in view of the letter addressed to the public Press by County Court Judges Curran and O'Connor Morris, on controversial subjects concerning their part in the administration of the exceptional legislation now in force in Ireland, he will take steps to submit the salaries of County Court Judges in Ireland to criticism in this House.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): No, Sir. As at present advised I am not prepared to make the change the hon. Member proposes.

Local Government (Ireland) Act (Amendment) Bill.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the Amendments to the Local Government (Ireland) Act (Amendment) Bill standing on the Paper, it is intended to proceed with that measure during the present session; and, if so, whether he can say when he proposes to provide time for its discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not yet despair of being able to find time for this Bill, but I am not at present in a position to make a definite statement on the subject.

Marine Insurance Bill.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will state why the Marine Insurance Bill [H.L.] has been withdrawn; and whether, in view of the representations in its favour by mercantile, shipping, and underwriting bodies, it will be reintroduced by the Government early next session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand from those who are fully acquainted with the proposals of this Bill that there was no reasonable prospect of sufficient time being available for its discussion during this part of the session. I can give no pledge as regards next session, but I should hope that in that session the Bill may be reintroduced.

Education Bill—Hiring of Denominational Schools.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, under the provisions contained in the Educa- Bill, in those cases in which a School Board has been set up, and a denominational chool has been hired by the Board from the denominational managers at a nominal rent, subject to a clause in the hiring agreement permitting the managers to terminate the agreement on giving twelve months notice, it will be possible for the managers to give such notice, and at the expiration thereof to turn the Board school into a school of a denominational character.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: At the end of such a lease as that contemplated by the hon. Gentleman in his Question, the buildings would revert absolutely to the lessors—that is to say, to the trustees or the managers of the voluntary school. But if it is desired to use these buildings as a denominational school, this would be a new school, and would come under the provisions of Clauses 9 and 10 of the Bill.

Brussels Sugar Convention.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can arrange that ample time shall be given for the discussion of the Resolution on the Brussels Sugar Convention, and that it shall be taken at such a period of the session as will give the interests throughout the country which are affected by the Convention as full opportunities as possible of expressing their opinion for the guidance of Parliament; and whether, if the Resolution which the Government will submit to the House should be carried, the Treaty will come into operation even though Parliament should decline to sanction the legislation which he has stated will be necessary to bring its provisions into operation in this country.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir; it is my hope that adequate time will be found for the discussion of the Resolution. That Resolution will bind Parliament to give legislative sanction to the Treaty. I cannot anticipate that Parliament will decline the obligation.

MR. LOUGH: When is it likely to be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot give any pledge as to the date, but it cannot be very long delayed.

Employment of Children Bill.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed, at an early stage of the next session of Parliament, with the Bill for the regulation of the out-of-school labour of school children, introduced last July by the late Home Secretary, and withdrawn last week by the present Home Secretary.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member will hardly expect me to foreshadow now the legislative programme for next session, but this reply must not be taken as indicative of a *non possumus* attitude on my part towards the particular measure to which the hon. Member refers.

Voluntary School Endowments.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether a complete Return has been published of the endowments of voluntary (public elementary) schools; and, if not, whether he will cause such a Return, showing the capital and income of each endowment, to be prepared and published as speedily as possible.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am informed that the preparation of such a Return would involve much hard labour and expense, and I am not prepared to grant it, but I would refer the hon. Gentleman to the Return of the income and expenditure of public elementary schools, published last year.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

JOHN LOCKIE, Esquire, for the Borough of Devonport.

IRELAND—ADMINISTRATION OF THE CRIMES ACT—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN, Member for Cork City, rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the proclamation, under the provisions of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, of the City of Dublin and of nine Irish counties since the rising of the House in August, and the danger to the public peace arising from the harsh and partisan administration of that Act;" but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. Speaker called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen:

The Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 17, until the Evening Sitting, this day.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee:—
(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

*(2.50.) MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) moved the omission of the words "consent of the" from sub-Section (*c*), with the intention of subsequently moving the omission of "be required to the appointment of" and the insertion of "appoint and dismiss." He explained that the effect of the combined Amendments would be to provide that the local education authority shall appoint and dismiss teachers. His first proposition was that the municipal corporations of this country and the County Councils as well, had proved themselves worthy of the confidence of the House, and ought therefore to have entrusted to them the appointment of teachers in connection with the elementary education of the country. Very few hon. Members would venture to assert that the County Councils were not capable of carrying out this particular duty. Already there were more undenominational elementary schools than there were denominational, owing to the fact that a large number of voluntary schools were carried on on undenominational lines, and he believed that after the passing of this Bill more and more schools would be handed over to the local authority. They might therefore assume that the House was prepared to give the local authority the power of appointing teachers in the large majority of the schools. He would like to point out how absurd it was that in one parish the ratepayers should have the appointment of the teacher while in the adjoining parish they should be precluded from having a voice in the matter, simply because in the one case the school was publicly provided while in the other the fabric belonged to a particular denomination. The only logical and sensible plan, in his humble judgment, was that the body which provided the resources for carrying on the work of the schools should also be allowed to appoint, as well as dismiss, the teachers. It should also have the staffing of the school and the decision as to the salaries to be paid. Under Clause 7 the Committee had already decided that the local education authority should be responsible for, and have control of, secular education, and in Clause 8 it was provided that it should keep efficient all public elementary schools and have the control of all expenditure. If they were now to decide that the managers should have the appointment of the teachers, surely they would be acting in violation of the provision which was to secure absolute control to the County Councils. Schoolmasters would naturally look for direction to the individuals who made the appointments, and it seemed to him nothing but a farce to pretend that the County Council would be able to have the control—the supreme control—of the education if it had not the power of, at any rate, exercising the initiative in regard to the appointment of teachers. It would mean that they were going to deprive the County Council of the power of appointing some 75,000 teachers, who were to be paid out of public funds, and not out of funds provided by the owners of the fabric of denominational schools. As a matter of practice, he believed, in many counties, if the Amendment were passed the County Council would delegate to the local managers the power of appointing the teachers. Bodies which were subject to public opinion were not likely to act in an intolerant manner either to Roman Catholic or High Anglican bodies which possessed schools of their own. All they need do was to see that, owing to the narrow views entertained by some exceptional individuals among the clergy, the managers did not abuse the power they would have if the provisions of the Bill were passed as they appeared on the Paper. He knew that most clergymen were prepared to act in conformity with the prevailing views of the people in their respective parishes, but still there were some who took an intolerant view of the opinions held by Nonconformists, and it was in order to safeguard the

interests of those Nonconformists that he thought it was essential the public should, if necessary, have the power of initiating the appointment of school teachers. The burden of work on Parliament had grown very much in late years, and it was desirable to devolve more of it on the County Councils. Surely this was a duty which might well be transferred to them. He could not see why the owners of the fabric who desired to teach a particular creed or dogma should be entitled to the appointment of teachers who were to be paid out of the rates. He would point out that after the passing of the Bill no great demand was likely to be made on the pockets of the owners of the fabric, and instead of them paying voluntary contributions to the amount of £750,000 a year, the money would henceforth come out of the rates. As to the maintenance of the fabric, there were in existence large endowment funds — especially in connection with Church of England schools—which would suffice to pay the cost of repairs. Again, many of these voluntary schools had been built to a large extent with public money. Up to 1882 Parliament had contributed £1,767,000 towards the cost of erecting these schools as against the £4,866,000 provided by voluntary effort. Since then many voluntary schools had been erected, because those who contributed to them desired not so much to see a particular creed or dogma taught, but to avoid the expense of a School Board. In 1870 the public contribution represented 34 per cent. only of the cost of maintaining education in voluntary schools; today it amounted to no less than 78¼ per cent., and it was only fair and right that the public who paid that 78¼ per cent. should have the appointment of the schoolmasters, whose salaries represented the main portion of the expenditure. What he and others resented was that there should be a clerical effort to control the civic and political action of the people on the assumption that any denomination had a divine call to appoint public secular teachers exclusively from their own sect. He and those with whom he acted denied the right of a church to deal with this matter without any regard to the free and independent choice of the people or the parents of the children in the schools. It might be said that the public had some little control, inasmuch as they could appoint two out of the six managers. But they would be in a permanent minority, and, in the event of there being a recalcitrant majority, friction was sure to exist between the managers and the local authority; proselytising would be possible, and a denominational atmosphere might be maintained throughout the whole period of secular instruction. The Government seemed to have one tune in the country, and a different practice in the House. The Prime Minister at Manchester said the Government heartily desired that the public control should be a reality. It was because that desire was shared by the supporters of the Amendment that they asked that the public authority should have the initiative in the appointment of teachers. The right hon. Gentleman went on to appeal to the friends of the Bill to turn their attention to increasing the authority of the Borough or County Councils. He (the hon. Member) desired to support that appeal, and to ask that properly elected representatives of the people should be trusted in this matter. Since the re-assembling of Parliament, no concession had been made indicative of a disposition on the part of the Government to give increased powers to the local authority. He believed that the authority could exercise the powers far better than the managers. The work might be delegated from time to time, but in order to avoid friction the supreme control should be in the hands of the authority. Already under the existing law Nonconformity was, to a large extent, penalised. The number of opportunities for the Nonconformist to become a teacher in an elementary school was very small as compared with that possessed by members of the Church of England. Over and over again cases had occurred of Nonconformists being compelled to become communicants of the Church of England in order to secure a livelihood. The Opposition did not want such a system perpetuated. They resented preferential treatment of members of the Church of England as against Nonconformists, and simply asked for a fair field and no favour. The

County Council could be relied upon to treat with tolerance any particular view in a particular locality. They did not seek to deprive the children of religious education, but they asked that it should not be provided by the State out of public money. The Government, by accepting the Amendment, would do a great deal to placate the Opposition and still the agitation in the country. Ninety-nine per cent. of the parents would be satisfied with the character of the religious instruction given under the supervision of the local authority. No doubt a certain number of clergymen, and probably all the Bishops, would resist the concession, but there were always some individuals not satisfied when any large measure of reform was passed. If the concession were refused, the Government would be handed down to obloquy, as having abused the confidence placed in them at the last election, when they were returned on a very different issue. The State would gain by the concession, the people would be more contented, the great stumbling-block in the Bill would be removed, the children would grow up better citizens, and if the Government sowed their seed well a rich and abundant harvest would be secured for the Empire.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.), on a point of order, submitted that the question of the appointment and the dismissal of teachers were quite distinct matters, one of which had already been partly dealt with. He therefore suggested that the Amendment should be put in such a form as to confine it to the appointment of teachers, and leave the question of dismissal free to be dealt with on its own merits.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the Amendment, which had to be taken in con junction with a subsequent proposal, raised the question of appointment and dismissal.

*MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE (intervening) said that, if it was the desire of the Committee, he would limit the Amendment to the appointment of teachers.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that in that case the present discussion would be limited to the appointment of teachers.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 14, to leave out the words 'consent of the'"—(*Mr. Joseph A. Pease.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

(3.8.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Committee, having listened so often to my observations on this Bill, will hardly require to be told what attitude the Government felt inclined to take up in regard to this Amendment. I have listened with satisfaction to the statement of the hon. Member that the County Councils are extremely competent to deal with the question of primary education, and that not only are they well fitted both by their constitution and by the time at their disposal to deal with all the provided schools in their respective areas, but he would, without misgiving, be glad to see the area of their responsibilities enlarged, anticipating nothing but advantage from the change. The hon. Gentleman is well acquainted with the West Riding of Yorkshire, the County Council of which has expressed great diffidence as to its power to deal with primary education, and I am glad to know that in his judgment, at any rate, those fears are unfounded. The real essence of the Amendment lies in the fact that it takes away from the managers the right to select teachers in a denominational school. The Government are of the opinion that the change in the Bill cannot be effected without destroying the character of the measure. It is true that in the counties in which, as the hon. Member said, the right to select the teachers is delegated to the managers, the actual working of the measure would be on the lines that we propose to lay down by statutory provision; but the hon. Member must be well aware that, though that might frequently happen, it would not always happen, and there is no security that it would ever happen. The trustees and managers of the voluntary schools would, I think, have every right to consider themselves deeply aggrieved by the proposal of the Government, if we were to insert a provision making it completely dependent on the action of the County Council whether or not the denominational schools were to retain their denominational character. It is a fundamental principle of the Bill that the denominational character of the denominational schools should be preserved, and I do not think it necessary at this stage of our proceedings to repeat the arguments which have been adduced on that subject. Those of us who support the Bill hold that, while giving up the control of secular education, subject to this limitation, to the popularly elected bodies, it is absolutely necessary in order to retain the denominational character of the schools that the appointment of the teachers should be left to the managers. Those who differ from that view will, of course, vote for the Amendment; those who agree with it will support the Government. This is a question, not of detail, but of principle; it affects the very root of the measure, and therefore the Amendment cannot be accepted.

Mr. BRYCE was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman, having admitted that the Amendment raised a question of principle, should have disposed of it in so brief and summary a fashion. The Opposition also looked upon it as a question of principle, and they had expected a much fuller and more serious statement of the objections entertained by the right hon. Gentleman to a proposal which *prima facie* had every argument in its favour. The First Lord of the Treasury jumped at the conclusion that this Amendment would destroy the denominational character of the schools completely, but the Opposition looked upon the maintenance of the character of denominational schools as almost the only feature of the Bill. As far as elementary education was concerned it was the one feature of the Bill. He felt that he must comment upon the extraordinary jump made in saying that the denominational character could only be preserved by retaining the appointment of the teachers for the denominational managers. Why was that so? They had suggested other methods before the recess. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to be under the impression that the first thing the local authority would do would be to endeavour to mortify or vex the local managers by appointing teachers who would not carry out their wishes.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I never said so.

Mr. BRYCE said that idea seemed to be in the right hon. Gentleman's mind, and was influencing him in giving this summary refusal to the proposal of his hon. friend. He believed that the local education authority would look out for the best men and for nothing else. The men who were best for secular education would necessarily be the best for religious instruction. They had had a large experience of this matter in the case of the School Boards, who now choose the masters with regard to their all-round fitness and capacity for teaching, their general character and moral tone, and the record of their lives; and the men so chosen, by the unanimous agreement of those who knew a great deal about religious teaching in our board schools, had been found most efficient in giving religious teaching. Why should that not be the case under this Amendment? He could not see that the right hon. Gentleman was justified in his assumption that the local education authority would override the managers. The First Lord of the Treasury had admitted that the choice of the master was the most vital appointment of a school, and all the professed anxiety of the Government to give the widest control to the local education authority came to nothing if the most essential part of choosing the teachers was withheld. If this duty was not vested in the local education authority, what became of their control over any kind of education? If the managers appointed the master, they would be his master, and the local education authority would be in the distance and rarely accessible, represented by only one person. The managers would be on the spot, possessing official power and social influence, and it was to them that the teachers would have to look as being practically their masters. No man could serve two masters, and the master, if he had to choose, would see his master in the local managers, and not in the local education authority. For this reason he looked upon the withholding of the power of choice from the local authority as a negation of their effective control over the school. There were other objections to givng the appointment of teachers to the local managers. There was the very serious objection that they lowered the status of the teacher himself. Teachers in elementary schools preferred to find a place in board schools, rather than in voluntary schools. Why? Not necessarily because the incomes were larger or more desirable, but because they were the servants of a public authority, and felt that they were more secure; they felt that they were not at the beck and call of a particular manager. In board schools, teachers were not required to discharge other functions in addition to teaching. They felt that they had a recognised position as servants of the State, which raised them as members of their profession. Then there was the argument that in enlarging the field of choice they enlarged the excellence of the teachers. By giving a wider choice, the local education authority would be enabled to look for the best men from every quarter, free from denominational restrictions or tests, thus improving the chance which all the schools possessed of drawing the best teachers in the country into their service. Surely at this time of day the arguments which thirty years ago induced this House to abolish tests in the universities, and pretty nearly everywhere else, and which only a few months ago led the authorities at King's College to abolish tests, ought to be weighty and important with regard to nearly half the schools of this country. Surely none would defend a system under which the managers might say to a candidate applying for a position in an elementary school "You are equally able, religious and conscientious with the candidate who is a member of our denomination, and even better, but because you will not declare yourself a member of our denomination the school cannot admit you as a teacher." He sometimes asked himself at what period were we living when we saw an anachronism like this surviving in the era in which we lived to obstruct the progress of education and the development of our schools? He had tried to indicate the objections they had to the plan of the Government, and he would content himself with saying that in addition to the injury to the individual and to the schools, and the trouble and friction which would be produced by this divided allegiance, he felt that the supreme argument to justify this Amendment was that until they gave to the local education authority the appointment of the masters they would not give it that absolute control which the Government professed to give.

(3.25.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will not detain the Committee, but as I was reproached for the brevity of my speech, may I, in order to understand the right hon. Gentleman's position, put to him two questions? Firstly, in his view would he desire that the education authority should consider the religious qualifications of the teacher to teach in a denominational school? In other words, would it be the duty of the education authority to see that the teacher of a Roman Catholic school was a good Roman Catholic? If not, I think he will admit that the idea of saying that this Amendment would safeguard the denominational schools is absurd. Secondly, if, on the other hand, they are to consider the fitness of particular teachers to teach the Roman Catholic religion in Roman Catholic schools, is that not applying what he describes as a religious test?

*MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) said he was going to argue this from the point of view of those who supported denominational schools. The great fact lying before those interested in denominational schools seemed to be that, unless this Bill was a sound one, denominational schools would go. If the people were trusted in regard to this matter sufficient teachers would be appointed able to give denominational teaching in denominational schools, and the Bill would work more smoothly than by this attempt to get all the teachers appointed by the managers, in order to safeguard the interests of those who desired to retain the denominational schools. On those grounds he appealed to the Government to consider the wisdom of the course they seemed inclined to adopt. In regard to his argument, he admitted at once that they must put the Roman Catholics on one side. This Bill was not promoted for the sake of the Roman Catholics, because five-sixths of the denominational schools in England were Church of England schools, and but for those schools this Bill would not have been introduced. He had always maintained that the Roman Catholic case was a separate one, for they attached more importance to a denominational atmosphere; they had made untold sacrifices for their schools, which generally existed in large centres of population where there were considerable numbers of Catholics, and consequently they were entitled to separate treatment. Neither side of the House would listen to separate treatment, however, and some other must be found. He thought if they left this question to the localities to deal with, it would be dealt with by them in a spirit of fairness. They had done it, and were doing it, in the evening schools, held in denominational schools. Every wise School Board had treated these evening schools on the basis, of appointing teachers satisfactory to the denomination, and no complaint or difficulty arose. He believed in that way, if a locality were trusted, Roman Catholics would not suffer the hardships they were afraid they would suffer under a more complete system of popular control than this Bill gave. He appealed to the Government in this way. Was this Bill fair to the country at large, and, above all, to Nonconformists? Had the country at large the chance of getting the best men for teachers or not under this system? Again, he appealed on the question whether it was necessary to have teachers all of one denomination for the denominational schools. Finally, he appealed to the Government on the question of whether, under the Bill which had caused so much irritation and annoyance, the system could last which the Government were now attempting to inaugurate. He need not worry about the question of fairness. Out of 20,000 schools in this country, some 12,000 were Church of England schools. Practically, what the Government said by the managers appointing teachers was this, that in all these 12,000 schools all the teachers must be members of the Church of England. That was, in three-fifths of the schools of the country they must have members of the Church of England, and only members of that denomination. In regard to the other two-fifths, the members of the Church of England had an equal chance. In the past they had a better chance because of their excellent training colleges. Supposing the population was divided almost equally between Churchmen and Nonconformists, they would take four-fifths of Churchmen as teachers, and one-fifth from the rest of the country. That was not fair, and no man could say so. Were they going to get the best men? They could not get the best men if they restricted the choice in this way. On the question of whether teachers should be all of the denomination, he would remind the House that the real difference between the teaching given in most of the Church schools and the better system of the Cowper-Temple teaching under our better board schools, was infinitesimal. If they could get at the average doctrinal teaching the parent would like given to the average child, he believed that the difference between the teaching in the Church schools and that given in the schools of the London, Manchester, and Oldham School Boards—which he happened to know something about—would be found merely infinitesimal. From the point of view of those who were Christians—other than Roman Catholics—in this country, they were, to a large extent, fighting about a mere shadow. In Protestant England they did not need this special denominational atmosphere. It was not fair, in the first place, in a single school district. In such a district, with a Nonconformist majority, what became of the inalienable right of the parent to have doctrinal teaching according to his view? What was wanted was not so much denominational teachers, but the best teachers they could get—true, honest men and women, with, if possible, the fear and love of God in their hearts. They wanted to make the children as good as possible, and for that purpose they ought to have religious teachers, but it was of infinitesimal importance that they should all be Church of England teachers even in denominational schools. This was a national scheme, and ought to be treated from a national point of view. They had no right, as a nation, to settle a scheme which must to a large extent be a scheme of proselytisation, although he admitted it was not meant to be anything of the kind. There were something like 365 sects in this country, and to carry out the claims for a denominational atmosphere in the school to its logical result each sect would require its own school. No such scheme as that could be national. It was not under any such scheme that the best men the country had produced had grown up. He asked whether there was any possibility that the system which the Government was going to inaugurate could last. He had no right to expect that his voice should have any effect, but he begged the Government to consider more carefully the wisdom of the course they were taking. He was perfectly certain that even in the interests of those schools which they desired to support this Bill was bound to break down, and with it would go the system they were trying so laboriously to set up.

(3.43.) MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) said he deeply regretted to hear from the First Lord that the question at issue in the proposal before the Committee was vital. He did not believe it was vital to the majority of his supporters on the Ministerial side, and he certainly did not believe it was vital to the very large majority of good sound laymen of the Church of England. From the business point of view he thought the arrangement was bad, and probably in many cases it would be unworkable. For what was it? The headmaster was the principal civil servant, the principal agent of the local authority; after he had been appointed by some one else, they fixed his salary and paid him. They would define his duties, the duties of his subordinates, his relations with his subordinates. They would have power to dismiss him if, on an appeal, they were sustained by the Board of Education—and only in that case—and then another authority stepped in and made the appointment. If they were to apply this method to any other practical business of life they would be laughed at. It remained for the Education Department to out-Herod Herod himself. The procedure laid down in the Bill resembled weather indicators. In foul weather out would come the local authority and dismiss the teacher if, on appeal, it was permitted in London to do so.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no appeal, only on secular grounds.

MR. MIDDLEMORE thought, with great respect to the right hon. Gentleman, there must be an appeal as to what were secular grounds. Proceeding with his analogy of the weather indicator, out, he said, in fair weather would come the managers and appoint the teacher. That was unbusiness like. But that was not his greatest objection. What civic right, what moral right had the Government to deprive the elected authority of the power of appointment? In England they valued that right so much that he believed if they had it in a written constitution this sub-Section would not have been possible without a prior alteration in the constitution. However that might be, he believed that this fundamental law was indelibly written in the beliefs of the people—that absolute control should be derived from the payment of the money which enabled the institution to exist. Then what moral right had they to inflict this great disability on half the teachers of the country? What had they done against the State that the State should turn and rend them in this way? Why should they be stricken with this disability? The same disability might in future be inflicted on the teachers of the voluntary schools. How had this situation arisen? It seemed to him that a section of the Church—and only a section—wanted public money and distrusted those who would supply it. [Cries of "No!" from the GOVERNMENT Benches.] They seemed to think that their fellow-countrymen were meditating some injustice against them. He did not believe that at all; and at any rate it was gross injustice to forestall an injustice by making an act of injustice on a very large body of most deserving men who were essential to the welfare of the Commonwealth. He did not believe that Church teaching would be preserved in that way. Church teaching would be threatened far more by the usurpations and exactions of extreme members of the Church than by any direct attack of Dissenters or otherwise. What did they fear from this Amendment to confer on the local authority the right to appoint teachers? In a speech published by his own great leader, the Colonial Secretary—

[Cries of "Oh, Oh!" from the OPPOSITION Benches]—the right hon. Gentleman was his own great leader. [AN HON. MEMBER on the Opposition Benches: "Where is he?"] In that speech the Colonial Secretary drew attention to the condition of things in large communities in Scotland where the School Boards, consisting of grave and stern old Presbyterians, invariably allowed the Roman Catholics to appoint Roman Catholic school masters in their schools, who were thoroughly satisfactory to the Roman Catholic managers of the schools. What should they fear in England? If a difficulty occurred, the managers would communicate with the clerk to the School Board, who would communicate with some member of the sub-committee, and then an arrangement would be made agreeable to all parties. On the other hand, what would happen if the local education authority were deprived of this essential right? First of all, the teachers would be given a grievance with which nine-tenths of the community would sympathise, and that would only be balanced by attaching an equivalent disability to the Church teachers. And in a dispute between the managers and the local authority, it would not be the local authority which would eventually go to the wall. He did not believe that much was to be feared for the Church schools from the hostility of the local education authorities. The guarantees would be of far less service to the Church schools than to the local authorities. He wished that the Church party had been largely generous in regard to this matter, that they had really trusted the people, and that they could have gone in for a great clause safe-guarding religious teaching in the various schools belonging to the different denominations. Having secured that, they might have left the future of the Church schools, both as regarded denominational teaching and general control, to depend only on the loyalty and affection of the community.

*SIR WILLIAM MATHER (Lancashire, Rossendale) said he wished to appeal to the Prime Minister to reconsider the position he had laid down. After the speech of the hon. Member for North Birmingham, the right hon. Gentleman should reconsider the expression he had made use of that he could not allow any deviation from the provisions in the Bill in regard to the appointment of the managers and the teachers in the non-provided schools. The right hon. Gentleman had said that it would not be fair to the denominational schools unless those provisions were maintained in the Bill, because these would be handed over, free of rent, for public use, and that a considerable amount of money would have to be spent in altering and repairing the premises. The *quid pro quo* for this boon was the two Clauses to which reference had been made. Personally, he protested most earnestly, for that was the bane of the whole business. The Government had tried to erect a national system of education under one authority which involved complete responsibility on one side in regard to one half of the children of the country, and only a diluted responsibility for the other children of the country. This Bill was full of checks and counter-checks. It was the most ingenious piece of construction that one could conceive of. It reminded him of the ingenious inventor who tried to make perpetual motion machines which, of course, never worked. He believed that the Bill, in its present shape, was unworkable, and he ventured to say that, while preserving the denominational rights which the right hon. Gentleman was so anxious to preserve, the Prime Minister might easily make an alteration in the Bill so as to make it a practical business measure for the purpose of giving to the children equal instruction in secular subjects throughout the length and breadth of the land, by vesting the appointment of teachers in the local education authority alike for the provided and the non-provided schools. He quite understood the difficulty of the right hon. Gentleman and of hon. Gentlemen opposite. They would not surrender the right of denominational teaching in the non-provided schools. He was not in the slightest degree moved in his opposition by any fear of clerical influence interfering with education in the schools. He did not think that that would make any difference whatever. He spoke only on educational grounds in favour of a simple, direct, self-acting plan for securing the education of the country under one authority; and he felt that the right hon. Gentleman might most reasonably concede the nomination of the teachers to the local education authority. There were other means by which the denominational character of the schools might be retained. After all, the denominational character of the schools could not be expressed in any other way or sense than through specific religious instruction. Teachers would be selected by the local authority for their moral and personal qualities as high-class teachers; and, of course, every denominational school manager would desire teachers possessing such qualities, just as much as the local authority. If, in addition, facilities for religious teaching were desired, it seemed to him that it would be the simplest thing in the world for any reasonable Churchman to secure, under the Bill, religious teaching at certain hours of the day by teachers selected for the purpose. If they could not secure a national system of education under the Bill by some modifications of the measure, they would be compelled to resist the proposals of the Government that the voluntary schools should be taken over free of rent. They would be prepared to pay rent for the schools, and to put the schools under local control from top to bottom. Let the schools be taken over at what they were worth, and let them be maintained at the cost of the local authority. Further, they would be prepared to secure that the denominational teaching now given in the schools should be provided for by the local authority at such times as would be convenient. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether that was not a better plan than that now proposed. The right hon. Gentleman was erecting an edifice on sand, whereas they desired to build it on a bedrock foundation.

(4.3.) SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said that the hon. Member who had just spoken had denounced the plan for appointing teachers in the Bill of the Government as tortuous and unworkable. In his opinion no other plan was likely to work more smoothly than the method provided in the Bill. He was not speaking on behalf of those who thought that the appointment of teachers should be exclusively in the hands of the local authority. He was speaking in the interest of the majority of the House, and he thought the majority of the country who recognised that, in taking over the voluntary schools, the teachers appointed should be agreeable to the managers and to the local anthority; and that on the appointment of teachers there must be a kind of dual responsibility—the religious qualifications of the teachers to be satisfactory to the denominational managers of the school, and the other qualifications of the teachers to be satisfactory to the local authority, by whom their salaries would be paid, and who would be responsible for the efficiency of the teaching. In speaking about teachers, he should like it to be distinctly understood that he was not referring to pupil teachers. He did not think that they were teachers at all; or that in any school, however denominational in character it might be, there should be any test imposed on pupil teachers, or that there should be any obstacle to their entering the teaching profession. With regard to real teachers, he would ask the Committee to consider how the scheme with the Bill would work. The management, by whom the appointment would be primarily made, would consist of a certain number of denominational members and a certain number of undenominational or publicly elected members. Roman Catholic or Church of England or Wesleyan managers, who had hitherto conducted the schools in accordance with their own religious denomination, would naturally pick out teachers of that denomination who, in their opinion, were intellectually qualified to conduct religious instruction in the schools, and would propose such teachers to the general body of the managers. Were they likely to propose anyone who was not intellectually efficient, or not fit to conduct the schools? It would be only in one case in a hundred where any such proposition would be made. The managers would look into the testimonials and antecedents of the teacher proposed, and it would be the duty of the undenominational managers to make a strong remonstrance if an improper person were proposed. That strong remonstrance would, in most cases, be attended to, because of the probable sequel that would follow if it were not attended to. If a candidate of obvious unfitness were proposed, and if the majority of the managers insisted on appointing him, then the minority would at once make representations to the local authority, giving the reasons why they objected to the appointment of that particular teacher. In nine cases out of ten, the local authority would take the representation of the minority as a sufficient warrant on which to act; but in case of doubt they would make inquiries into the antecedents of the teacher, and if his antecedents were such as not to warrant his selection then they would exercise their veto. Therefore, in the first place, it was extremely unlikely that any improper person would be proposed; secondly, if an improper candidate was proposed it was extremely likely that, if the minority objected, he would be withdrawn; and, finally, it was quite certain that the veto of the local authority would prevent the employment of an improper teacher.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) said that the right hon. Gentleman appeared to think that he had entirely disposed of the Amendment when he showed how unlikely it was that the managers would propose a notoriously unfit person, and how easy it would be to get over such an appointment if it were made. No one ever suggested that the board of management would go out of their way to appoint an unfit person. What was contended was that the restriction in the Bill limited the choice of the managers. He assumed that they would appoint the best men they could find who came up to the qualifications that would be required of them. What were those qualifications? Participation in Church services or employment in a garden. That was the view that had hitherto been taken. But when the right hon. Gentleman said that the head of management would not be likely to appoint an unfit person to occupy the position of teacher, did not the argument apply with still greater force to the local authority? Would they be likely to select any person who, on religious grounds or otherwise, would be distasteful not only to the managers but to the parents. The thought that pervaded that proposal of the Government, as it pervaded many other proposals in the Bill, was a want of faith in the commonsense and good feeling of the people. The Government had made great concessions as to increasing the control of the local authority over secular education. Let them trust the local authority in the matter, and believe that they would not do anything outrageous or against the wishes of the managers and the parents. The hon. Member for North Birmingham seemed to him to hit the nail on the head. The hon. Member asked the Committee to put out of sight the denominational difficulty and to ask themselves, was this a businesslike proposal? The teachers were to be the agents and officers of the local authority, who would be responsible for secular education; were they to be chosen by another body altogether? That, in itself, condemned the proposal in the Bill. They should choose either one course or the other. They could not have the two authorities mixed up in the way proposed; they should trust either one or the other. He would trust the managers, and would make them the representatives of the locality. That was the straightforward, old-fashioned, honest way to which they were accustomed. The Government declined to do that. Instead, they proposed a round-about election of a local authority through means of the County Councils, with some responsibility, more or less direct, to the public. Let them trust that body and not go running about from one to the other, using each as a sort of watch dog on the other. Surely they could believe that their countrymen were not likely deliberately to take any administrative step which would have such a ruinous effect on the interests of education as the appointment of unfitted teachers.

(4.15.) Mr. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.) said he hoped it was not even now too late to express a hope that the Government might vary their decision with regard to this important question. The speech of the hon. Member for North Birmingham, he thought, was one which must commend itself to both sides of the House as the speech of a fair-minded man who had approached the question with an unbiased mind. He was satisfied in his own mind that the sentiment expressed by the hon. Gentleman was the view held by a large majority of fair-minded Churchmen. If the Government hoped to get this Bill through without intense bitterness and protracted controversy, he thought they would do well even now to reconsider their decision. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University expressed the opinion that the committee of management was the proper body to select the teachers of the non-provided schools, and had said that if any difficulty arose the public representatives on the board of managers would be able to bring the matter under the consideration of the local authority. Such a statement presupposed that the two public representatives would be men who were not in sympathy with the trust representatives, but in the majority of cases the public representatives were men whose views were in harmony with the trust managers, and therefore in nine cases out of ten they were not likely to turn round on their friends unless some very grave scandal occurred. It seemed to him that this Amendment dealt with the most serious question which this Bill raised; the question of whether religious tests were to be in vogue in the public elementary schools in future. Under the system at present in force there might be some defence set up for the system; it might be said the voluntary subscribers contributed considerable sums towards the support of the schools, and that therefore it was only right that they should have a right to the election of the teachers. He did not assent to that view, but, even so, it seemed to him that when this Bill passed it swept away every vestige of the defence that existed at the present time. Up to the present the voluntary schools had failed by reason of their religious tests; they had not been able to afford the best teachers, because it was not likely that the best teachers with all the testimonials they possessed were going to apply to be instated as teachers in voluntary schools when the first thing to which they would have to submit would be the humiliation of being cross-examined as to their church opinion. In most cases the question put to these men would not be as to what their religious beliefs were, but what their church opinions were. The Government had taken up a most illogical position in reference to this matter. It was admitted that nearly the whole of the time of the persons occupying the position of teachers in the schools would be taken up in secular instruction, yet, notwithstanding that fact, their appointment was to be given to men who had least to do with secular education. It had been said by the Government that the supreme object that they had in view in introducing this Bill was to establish the education of this country on a thoroughly national foundation. He could not for the life of him see how that was going to be done, if they were going to shut out from half the elementary schools of the country men who held certain religious opinions, and, therefore, he was forced to believe that the real object of the Bill was not to establish the education of the country on a thoroughly national foundation, but upon denominational lines. Every penny the master of the voluntary schools would receive would come from the pockets of the taxpayers or the ratepayers; he would become to all intents and purposes a State servant, and the Government were not doing what was fair to the taxpayers or the ratepayers unless they gave the widest possible basis for his appointment. The bargain was not fair and reasonable. The Church party only gave the use of the building, which they had also to maintain in a proper state in future, but in return they had first of all power, through the clergyman or his nominees, to teach the children a particular form of religion; they had power to appoint all the teachers whose salaries were paid by the taxpayers or ratepayers; they had power to exclude teachers who did not profess certain religious principles; and, by their majority on the committee of management, power to overrule the public managers. He put it to any fair-minded man that that bargain was not a fair and reasonable one. It had been said that the religious atmosphere of the schools must be maintained. If that were so, let it be maintained but not in the manner proposed by the Government. The most serious grievance which the Nonconformists had, and the most serious difficulty they had to meet, arose in parishes where there was only one school, the Church school. Why should the schoolmaster in these schools be called upon to do this work? What did the clergyman of the parish and his curate do? It was not a question of their being over-worked, as many were in large London districts; this difficulty presented itself in the small rural parishes. The work might well be done by the clergyman himself. Those were his views on the Amendment before the House, which he considered was founded on justice and reason. He hoped the Government would see their way to accept the Amendment.

*MR. KEMP (Lancashire, Heywood) differed from those hon. Members who argued that this was not a business-like proposal. In every bargain the consent of both parties had to be secured, and if the present holders of the voluntary schools were to give up those schools the Government had to make some arrangement to which they would agree. The fears expressed by the Opposition as to the great bitterness that would be aroused in the country were, he thought, grossly exaggerated. A strong argument in favour of the Government case was that in the public schools sectarian teaching of an extreme kind was given, and yet Nonconformist parents had no hesitation in sending their sons to those schools. He hoped, therefore, that the Government would stand to their proposals.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) thought the First Lord of the Treasury was right when he said that the Committee had a clear issue presented by this Amendment. The issue raised was between the principles of the Party opposite and those of the Opposition. The proposal was, practically speaking, to give the control of one-half of the schools in the country into the hands of private persons. If the scheme under the Bill was to be a national scheme, the control of the schools—which really depended on the appointment of the masters—ought to be in the hands of the national authority, whatever it was, to which the education of the country was entrusted. Complaints had been made of misrepresentation. There were complicated details in the Bill which might have been misrepresented, but upon this question there had not been, and could not be, misrepresentation—the issue was much too clear. Hitherto, we had had a fragmentary and unsatisfactory system of education. It was admitted that the condition of the voluntary schools had not been satisfactory. By the plan of the Government it was proposed to set that matter right: there was to be co-ordination. But in all other departments of educational work tests had been abolished. In the Universities tests had been abolished; they had been done away with in denominational establishments; and the Secretary of the Board of Education himself belonged to a denominational institution in which all tests had been abolished. Denominational tests were not permitted to interfere with higher education; and yet the foundation of all—elementary education—was to be poisoned by their imposition. The Government were building their educational system upon an unsound foundation which would not, and could not, stand. They might pass the Bill by their Party majority, but a system which had its very basis poisoned by this question of sectarian tests would never be accepted by the country. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had said that if a man was notoriously unfit he would not be accepted. But that was not the question. A good educational system should secure not only the exclusion of the improper candidate, but the acceptance of the best candidate. That, however, was just what the proposed system prevented. Two categories of schools were to be established — the provided schools, the masters for which could be chosen from the whole nation, and the best men selected for the particular posts, and those in the second category for which the masters would be selected from only a section of the nation, and which consequently would be distinguished as second grade schools. Voluntary schools had hitherto stood in the second grade as compared with board schools, and their inferiority had been due not merely to want of funds, but also to the lack of a reasonable choice of teachers. That position the Government were proposing to perpetuate. What would happen was obvious. If a school wanted a master and two men presented themselves—

neither of them improper, but one better than the other — it would frequently happen that the better man could not be selected because he failed to satisfy the test of the clergyman. It was a question whether the candidates would even come forward, because they would feel it was useless unless they qualified by becoming members of the Church of England. That was an educational disability which made the measure a bad educational Bill; it was a fatal fault at the very root of the proposal. It could not be denied that the success of a school depended on the character of the master. If, therefore, the entire system was founded on a basis upon which the best master could not be chosen, it would be one which was not national, and which in the long run the nation would not accept. In fact, a question of profoundest principle was raised, and, having the defects he had mentioned, the Bill, as an educational plan, was an imposture, and could never pass as a current scheme in the country. The matter had also its political aspect. There were said to be 75,000 teachers in these schools—75,000 officers in one of the most honourable professions it could be the ambition of men to follow, but from which they were to be excluded on account of their religious belief. What other civil profession was subject to such a disability? That was the political aspect of the question, and it was created by giving this power of appointment to men who would conscientiously exercise it in favour of their own denomination. They had done so in the past, and the object of the Bill was to secure them in the right to exercise that power. The educational system of the country was being founded upon denominational tests in order to secure to a greater degree than even at present existed, by additional grants of public money, supremacy of the Established Church. That was a policy which in his opinion would not, and could not, be accepted, and it was difficult to believe it possible at this time of day for such a plan to be proposed. This was a reactionary measure of the most vicious type; reversing the policy of this nation practically for a century which had established civil and religious liberty by doing away with these tests first of all in the case of Dissenters, then by Catholic emancipation, in the case of the Jews, and in the case of all religious tests. That was the history of the accepted policy of this country for a century, and this Bill was founded upon a reversal of that policy. The Government were laying the foundation stone and corner stone of this Bill upon the principle of religious exclusion, and that was the question at issue today. That was the question which would be at issue as long as it contained this principle. He had no hesitation in saying that in his opinion any public body or any private individual was entitled by all legitimate means to resist any scheme founded upon such a principle as that. He could understand a public body saying "You offer us this Bill, and you impose upon us the obligation to carry on the education of the people, but you attach to your measure such conditions as we cannot and will not accept. We will not make ourselves responsible for the education of the people unless you give us the free means of choosing the best masters of the school; we will not accept the responsibility of educating the people if you exclude one half of the nation from the persons who shall be occupied as our agents to carry out education in the schools." The Government had raised, and they were raising, resistance to their scheme by adopting as the foundation of their plan a principle which this country had condemned in every other department of the public service, and a principle which had been condemned in the most valuable and essential of all the parts of our civil life in the education of the people. It was for that reason they condemned this scheme by moving this Amendment.

(4.50.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have listened attentively to the speech of the right hon, Gentleman, and I do not for the life of me know whether the right hon. Gentleman is in favour of retaining the denominational character of the voluntary schools or whether he is opposed to it. Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared frankly to say to the Committee: "I want to abolish the denominational schools root and branch, and substitute for them a pure and unadulterated system of provided schools of the Cowper-Temple class"? Is that what the right hon. Gentleman wants? The right hon. Gentleman does not reply.

The right hon. Gentleman either cannot, or will not, answer that simple and elementary question. But a great many of the right hon. Gentleman's friends have answered it; and said that for their part they wish to preserve the denominational character of the schools. I think my hon. friend behind me, the Member for North Birmingham, took that view, and I am sure the hon. Member for the Rossendale Division took that view, and I think the same view is also taken by the hon. Member for Oldham and other speakers. They want to preserve the denominational character of the schools; therefore, whatever the right hon. Gentleman or those who sit near him on the Front Opposition Bench may desire, those followers of theirs have said that for their part they desire to preserve the denominational character of the voluntary schools, but they do not like the particular method for so doing proposed in the Bill. But let the Committee consider the alternatives. The very fact that we preserve the denominational character of the voluntary schools, and that religious teaching is to be carried on in these schools, surely means—if it means anything—that somebody or other must determine whether or not the teacher is qualified to teach denominational religion. You may evade this question, but that is what it all comes to. If you mean to abolish denominational schools, then do so, but if you mean to keep them then admit it. The teachers must be selected with some regard to their capability of teaching denominational religion. If that be admitted, then you have given up this question that there is a so-called test, about which the right hon. Gentleman was so eloquent. The question is whether you shall, or shall not, take this into consideration. By an irresistible train of reasoning you are driven into that dilemma. The question therefore is who is to see after what I may call the teacher's religious qualifications. It seems to me absolutely clear that there are only two bodies, one of which should have the duty thrown upon it. One of these bodies is the managers of the schools to whom the duty is entrusted by the Bill. The only other alternative is the local authority.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): And they find the money.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Government prefer the managers because they have already got under Clause 7 a denominational complexion.

DR. MACNAMARA: Who gave it to them?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: At any rate, the majority of the managers are denominationalists. Therefore the managers are clearly qualified to form some judgment as to the capacity of the teachers to teach denominational religion. As to the local authority, do hon. Gentlemen opposite propose to throw upon it by statute the obligation of considering the denominational qualifications of teachers? If right hon. Gentlemen opposite do not propose to throw upon it that obligation by statute, then they leave it absolutely open to the local authority at its will or pleasure to say whether or not religious qualifications shall be taken into account in the selection of teachers for the voluntary schools. I presume that those hon. Members opposite who desire to preserve the denominational character of the voluntary schools will not object to making it obligatory by statute on the local education authority to consider whether a teacher is, from the point of view of religion, suitable to the school to which he is to be appointed. But is that a duty we can place on the local education authority? Surely the objections to such a course are numerous and obvious. One is, that it will arouse a profound and, I think, a just apprehension in the breasts of a large number of people who are interested in the denominational schools. The hon. Member for Oldham has suggested that we should differentiate between Church of England schools, in which I think the local education authority is competent to appoint the teachers, and the Roman Catholic schools, in which, in my view, it is not competent to appoint the teachers. All I can say is that I wish good luck to any Government or any Administration which is going to try to distinguish in this matter of elementary education between the Church of England schools and the Roman Catholic schools to the advantage of the Roman Catholics. I promise them a bad quarter of an hour in the country. Let the Committee remember that the local authority is debarred by the Cowper-Temple Clause from introducing the religious question into the schools. But if it were left to the local education authority to decide the religious qualifications of the teachers, it would be compelled to take into account that element of discord. I cannot conceive that such a scheme is a tolerable scheme. As for all the talk about the hardship to the teaching profession involved in the proposal of the Bill, I will not deal with it, for that is but a side issue, simply remarking that that injustice—if it is an injustice at all—is not removed by any plan which preserved the denominational character of the schools. Therefore, if we are to have Roman Catholic teachers in Roman Catholic schools, Wesleyan teachers in Wesleyan schools, and Anglican teachers in Anglican schools, it is an essential part of any plan to preserve the denominational character of the schools. Therefore, I say in the interest of common logic, let right hon. Gentlemen opposite give up these arguments about tests, about the injury to the teaching profession, and come forward frankly and say they were unalterably opposed to the continuance of the voluntary schools and fight the battle out on that issue. This inability to face the real problem at stake reflects very little credit on the logic of our debates, and certainly is not calculated to bring to the settlement of the question that clear-cut decision which I should be glad to see brought to bear upon it.

*(5.0.) Mr. ASQUITH (Fife, E.) said the right hon. Gentleman had endeavoured by a dialectical artifice to turn the attention of the Committee from the only question before it. The question whether or not the denominational character of the schools should be continued was not the matter now at issue. [Ministerial cries of "It is."] That question was not in the least involved in the Amendment before the Committee. The right hon. Gentleman might have quoted him among those who were willing to retain the denominational character of the voluntary schools. They were at any rate prepared to acquiesce in the maintenance of those schools for the purpose of dealing with the Bill and the settlement proposed by the Government. The fallacy underlying the right hon. Gentleman's argument was this—that you cannot preserve in its integrity honest denominational teaching in these schools unless you subject all the teachers to be employed in them to a denominational test. He entirely traversed that argument; there was not the slightest foundation for it. What was the issue which this Amendment raised? It was the issue whether the selection of the teachers who were to be employed in these denominational schools should be in the hands of the local authority or in the hands of the managers. This was now, and the right hon. Gentleman did not dispute it, to all intents and purposes a great State service. Teachers, when this Bill came into law, would be as much employees of the State as the Army, Navy, and the Civil Service. Every penny which went to their remuneration for the performance of their duties would come out of the pockets of the ratepayers or the taxpayers, and there would not be five minutes of their time given to the instruction of the pupils, whether secular or religious, for which they would not be paid out of public funds. That could not be disputed.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, I dispute it.

*Mr. ASQUITH asked from what other sources one halfpenny of their remuneration would come. They were constantly told that the pecuniary burdens which would fall on the managers and supporters of these schools would be the consideration for their preponderating share in the management. The pecuniary burdens of the managers were to be measured by the cost of keeping the fabric in good repair, and the interest on the cost of the fabric itself. He would take the value of the schools at £15,000,000 or £20,000,000. What part of that sum went to the remuneration of the teachers, and how could they found on the fact that these schools had been built by the denominations and that the managers were to keep them in repair a claim to the appointment of the teachers? The whole cost of the maintenance of the school, including the salary of the teacher, came out of public funds, and to state the proposition in the form of a question was to make it answer itself. *Primâ facie* the choice and appointment of the teacher ought to be vested in the body which had to contribute the whole cost of keeping the school efficient. The whole dispute arose out of the suspicion—of which the right hon. Gentleman and his supporters could not divest themselves—that these bodies publicly chosen could not be entrusted with the duty of appointing the teachers. It was the right hon. Gentleman's rooted distrust, which appeared over and over again in the Clauses of the Bill, not only competence, but of the honesty, of the bodies he was going to call into existence, and to which he was giving nominal control of the education of the country, which formed the sole ground for his opposition to this most reasonable proposal that the local education authority should have the right of appointment. The House of Commons could not start on the creation of a vast new system of public education with a measure steeped in suspicion and distrust of those who were to administer it. When once they credited these bodies with honesty and capacity to discharge their functions, the argument in favour of their having this elementary right to appoint the teachers from the educational, financial and administrative point of view was overwhelming. He would not go over the ground so well traversed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire. Let him summarise what lay at the root of the question. In the first place, if the Committee left this power of appointment in the hands of the managers, they were practically confining the area of selection to the members of a particular religious denomination. It was useless and idle to say that the power they were giving to the local education authority to veto the appointment on educational grounds formed a remedy. It was nothing of the kind. It was not an adequate safeguard at all. Therefore they were going to starve these schools. [Cries of "No."] It was starving the schools if they gave them a less efficient instead of a more efficient staff for the instruction of the children. They were going to starve the schools by placing practically uncontrolled power in the hands of denominational and non-representative bodies, so that from the educational point of view that was objectionable. From the political point of view it was even more objectionable, because, no matter under what veiled language they might disguise it, it meant that on the entrance to a large public service they were going to impose a particular denominational test. Then there was the administrative objection. Could they possibly imagine a more fruitful source of administrative friction in the conduct of these schools than to have on the one hand a body of managers who did not pay the salaries of the teachers, and on the other hand the local education authority who paid the salaries and were responsible to the ratepayers and yet with no voice in their appointment? Taking human nature as it was, and taking English public life as it was, they could not possibly bring into existence a system more calculated to wear out by constant friction and attrition two independent and practically autonomous authorities, one of which managed and did not control, while the other controlled and did not manage.

LORD ALWYNE COMPTON (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade) controverted the statement that the teachers would receive their salaries entirely from taxation and rates. To his mind that was a financial fallacy. What was the asset at present of the denominational school? They possessed a definite asset in the buildings and endowments. The value of that asset had been estimated in various ways. Supposing it was £700,000 a year, which was something near the mark, that must be taken into consideration, because that sum of money naturally would go into the total income out of which would come the salaries of the teachers. He had often heard it stated in the course of the debate that the bargain was one-sided, and that the Government in producing this Bill had had to make a bargain with people with whom a bargain had to be made. (Laughter and cheers.) Let him explain what he meant. The asset which he had spoken of was in existence, and nothing could take it away. He did not suppose there was an hon. Member on the Opposition side of the House who would have the hardihood to stand up and say that he wished to take away this asset by spoliation. In the case of the Nonconformists, what was the asset which they had brought into the bargain? They might say that their asset was their conscience. He had a great deal of respect for the conscience of those who differed from him in religious matters, but he would ask—where had been their conscience for the last thirty years? He had had a great deal to do with voluntary schools in the country, and he asserted boldly that in 99 per cent. of the voluntary schools of this country Nonconformists' children had been for the last twenty-five or thirty years going to the denominational schools, and although, under the law, the parents had been in a position to withdraw their children at the time of religious education, in the case of 99 per cent. of the children in the rural districts that right had never been taken advantage of. The children, for one reason or another, had attended the religious instruction in the denominational schools. Under statute the teacher was required to publish the days and the times when religious instruction would take place, and there was no disability imposed by the statute on any child who was withdrawn from the school at these times. It was a very curious thing that the conscience of the Nonconformist had been so dormant that he had allowed his child, of his own free will, to go into the denominational school, and to receive the instruction which was there given. Let them hear no more of this question of a one-sided bargain. If it was one-sided he challenged hon. Members to show how it was so. He had shown that there was an asset; he did not know by what means the Government had entered into an agreement that that asset was to be handed over.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) replying to the noble Lord's argument that the denominational assets amounted to £700,000 per annum (he did not say that that was or was not an accurate estimate) maintained that the patronage of the appointment of 70,000 teachers was worth it and far more. The First Lord of the Treasury had stated that the supporters of the Amendment were in favour of the out and out abolition of the denominational schools. Whether that was so or not, it had nothing to do with this particular Amendment. Supposing the Amendment was carried, and that the teachers were appointed by the local education authority, the managers would have the right to prevent these teachers giving religious instruction against their views. The managers could bring in other persons, or call in a clergyman to give denominational teaching. Denominational teaching would therefore be secured. The only thing that would result would be that the teachers would not be submitted to a religious test. They had had a very interesting speech from the hon. Member for North Birmingham, but he had waited in vain for one or more of the signatories to the memorial to the First Lord of the Treasury on the question of the appointment of teachers. He was anxious to know what the First Lord had said to satisfy these hon. Gentlemen to induce them to withdraw from the position they had taken, and to commit themselves to support the Bill as it stood. They ought to have some reason from these hon. Gentlemen for their change of view, for it was conceivable that the supporters of the Amendment might also change theirs. He would ask the Attorney General why the Government haggled at this Amendment. They must interpret the Bill by what it said, and not by what they were told were the intentions of the Government. The local authority could give directions as to any matter relating to secular instruction. Now, surely a matter relating to the appointment of a teacher who was to give secular instruction must be a matter relating to secular instruction, and that therefore the local authority had power in regard to the appointment of a particular master. He was well aware that it was argued that that power was destroyed by reference to sub-Section (*c*). But under that sub-Section the consent of the local education authority was required to the appointment of the teachers. That merely meant that if the local education authority gave no directions, the managers could appoint subject to the consent of the local education authority when their appointment was made. The inference drawn from that sub-Clause was not a real inference. Was it not time that the Government should consider the children?

Which was the better method of appointment in the interests of the children? The local education authority would have a far larger choice to draw upon than the managers. He quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman opposite that the managers would appoint teachers intellectually efficient, but they could only do the best they could with the material at their hand; they could not have the same chance of making a good selection as a large local authority. If the local authority had the power of appointing the teachers, and not the managers, the former would be the supervisor of the whole school area, both as regarded provided and the unprovided schools. Why not adopt the system of the London School Board which selected a certain number of candidates and asked the managers to choose one, and not to submit the candidates to a religious test? From that point of view he thought the Government ought to give far greater consideration than they had done to the great evil they were likely to create by refusing to grant the appointment of the teachers to the local authority.

(5.26.) MR. EDWARDS (Radnor) said that the noble Lord who spoke last from the Benches opposite referred to the Church schools as an asset which the denominations had given to the public. Well, if all the Church schools had been built entirely by means of Churchmen's money, then he thought there might be something in the argument. But he believed the noble Lord would admit that the numerous grants of public money which had been made to the Church had enabled it to build far more schools than it would have been able to do with only denominational subscriptions. There was this further point. There was a school not very far from where he lived. It is now a Church school, and the noble Lord would claim it as a Church asset. But if he went into the history of that school, he would find that it was built by a "voluntary" rate imposed upon the people of the parish, although a great majority of the people were Nonconformists. He admitted that the land was given by the landlord, who was a Churchman, but it was intended that the school should be a parochial school and not a Church school. After the rate was imposed and paid, and the school built, the school was transferred to the National Society, and its control was vested in the clergyman and the churchwardens. No Nonconformists had a right to be pupil teachers in that school, although the Nonconformists were, in that parish, in the proportion of twenty to one of Churchmen. The Prime Minister had said that, in order to maintain the denominational character of the schools they must have a Churchman as head teacher. He did not think that was necessary at all. For instance, in the Church schools in his parish the great majority of the pupils were Nonconformists. Now it was an understood thing that on four days in the week what was called undenominational religious instruction was given, and only on one day in the week was the Church Catechism taught by the Church clergyman. It was a very simple thing for a Nonconformist to be headmaster in that school. He felt rather strongly on this point, because in his county they had fifty-two schools, of which thirty-six were Church schools, and sixteen board or British schools. What was the result? In two-thirds of the schools in the county Nonconformists could apply to be headmasters or pupil-teachers. If the Bill passed in its present shape, in a county where the vast majority of the people were Nonconformists, the teaching profession would be shut in the face of the vast majority of the people. That would be a loss to the county, and a national loss as well. They were all agreed that the religious controversy was a great danger, and it was a scandal that it should stand in the way of the education of the people. Some said it was the extreme Church party which was in fault, and others the extreme sectarians, but however it might be, this Bill would not relieve the grievances of the Nonconformists, and therefore he supported the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR appealed to the Committee to bring this debate now to a close.

*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) said he had not troubled the House on this Amendment before, and he should not have done so now but he desired to put forward an entirely new view. He desired the Committee to look at the matter from the point of view of the managers themselves. The House did not know probably the very great difficulty managers had in the selection of teachers, being themselves such a small body. These vacancies very often occurred suddenly. The managers of a small school could have no knowledge of other teachers, and very probably advertised and never got an answer to their advertisement. At last someone heard of the vacancy. He or she came over on a bicycle, and arrived grimy and perspiring and wanted an interview. One could not find out everything at an interview. He or she brought testimonials. The House knew what was the use of testimonials; if you were thoroughly incompetent you could not be got rid of except with a testimonial. They could not get rid of an incompetent Under Secretary of State without giving him a testimonial as a Colonial Governor; and it was the same with schoolmasters. Then there was the question of salary. Of course the managers of the school said the salary was above the average, and the candidate said it was below. He had no hesitation in saying that 99 out of every 100 managers in the country parishes would be only too grateful if the House would take over this disagreeable responsibility and put it on the local authority. A strong local Committee could keep a register of teachers and candidates, and would know the good and bad teachers. They could also give promotion where it was deserved, and stop it where it was not deserved. He thoroughly agreed with what the hon. Member for Oldham said about religious teaching. The Prime Minister said in a previous debate that most of the voluntary schools were originally Church of England schools. Yes, but what Church of England? The Church of England, when these schools were founded, fifty or sixty years ago, practised and taught what were now called Nonconformist doctrines. If they could now have in all schools the teaching given by the Church of England in the '40's or '50's, he believed it would be found not to differ fundamentally from the School Board teaching at the present day. He hoped the Government would not think this was a denominational question, because there was no reason why the local education authority should not be able to make denominational appointments as well as the managers. This was not a question of denomination, and he wished the Government would look at it, not from a sentimental point of view, but from a business point of view, and accept the Amendment of his hon. friend.

Sir Brampton Gurdon.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said he approached the consideration of this Bill without the slightest sectarian bias or animus. Every man had a right to his own religious belief. Mr. Disraeli had once said, when questioned as to his religion, that his religion was that of every man of common sense, and, when further pressed upon the subject, said men of common sense never told what their religion was. That was his own view. For his part, he was opposed to even one farthing being given to the voluntary schools out of the money of the taxpayers of the State, and he was opposed to any species of religion being taught in any school in the country at the expense of the State, but that was not the question here. They found here that the voluntary schools were bankrupt, and while the Churchmen had strong opinions as to what should be taught in these schools they objected to pay for them. The Government objected to such a state of things as that, and this Bill was brought in in order to make the people pay what the Church of England would not pay for its own Church schools. Then they were told that the Church did contribute something; that it lent its schools for a certain number of hours to the State, and the Committee was asked, in consideration of that, to allow the Church to appoint all the masters in the schools. Every one knew what occurred in rural parishes; they knew the influence of the parson, the squire, and the chief farmers, and they knew the parson was absolute master of the schools, and would remain so if he had the selection of the teachers. That was the position he would really be in, because the right hon. Gentleman had said that only two teachers were to be appointed by the community, and four by the parson and his friends. Naturally the parson would appoint a member of the Church of England. Was that a religious test or not? These schoolmasters were practically civil servants. It was as bad, atrocious and dishonest to impose a religious test on anyone who wished to follow the teaching profession, as it would be to impose it on anyone who desired to take a seat on the Treasury Bench. It had been said that the parents were satisfied; that they did not insist on their children being withdrawn when religious education took place. No doubt that was so. They would be marked men if they did. They did not dare to do so. But to say that the Nonconformists approved of their children being taught Church religion was ridiculous. He would be glad to see the whole matter settled in regard to these schools by the Government saying that they would pay a fair rent for the school to be used during the hours of secular education, in consideration of the public authority appointing the schoolmasters, but this bargain was an unfair one, and handed over the religious instruction of the entire rural population to the Church of England. He considered the proposition of this Bill was monstrous, and if he had his way, the Opposition would withdraw from the House in a body, and leave the Prime Minister to do what he pleased with the Bill. He did not see any use in any of these little tinkering Amendments; they would not do away with the voluntary schools or with any religious teaching in the board schools. But it should be remembered that at the last General Election it was distinctly stated that the sole issue before the country was the war, and it was not fair to use a majority so obtained to hand over the schools of the country to clericalism. He was sorry that hon. Members on his own side of the House were so fond of hearing themselves talk, and that they would not take the advice he gave them of washing their hands of the whole concern by saying, "We have nothing to do with what you pass in the House of Commons beyond the question of the war; we will appeal from the House of Commons to the people outside and make that the issue of the next general election, and we hope that the Government will give us a general election as soon as possible in order that the question between us and you may be decided."

(5.50.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) deprecated the course suggested by his hon. friend as one which was ill-adapted to amend the Bill. He agreed that they had to face the question of the voluntary schools, and his own point of view was that they should either buy up the voluntary schools or pay a rent for them. The Prime Minister had provided the means. There was to be a financial provision in the Bill, which would, no doubt, be reached some time, allocating a sum of £900,000, half of which would pay a substantial rent for all the voluntary schools in the country. The amount of money needed for this purpose had been grossly exaggerated. He knew many voluntary schools, and knew they were built not only by subscriptions from Churchmen, but also Nonconformists as well—[A VOICE: And by railway companies]—and by contributions of labour as well as money. It had been said that the Bill proposed a not unfair bargain, but no bargain was fair or just, which meant the selling of the civic rights of the community for any sum of money. It was the duty of the community to provide an efficient system of education for the children, and they had no right for any sum of money to bargain that away to any denomination. Nonconformists were taunted that they were not prepared to make such sacrifices for their consciences as Churchmen, but Churchmen were first in the field, simply because they happened to possess a monopoly in the land. In his opinion Nonconformists who paid for a School Board made greater contribution to education than a Churchman who subscribed to a voluntary school.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): We do both.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he would take the case of Lord Penrhyn. His Lordship subscribed £400 a year to the voluntary schools in his district, where the teachers were all Churchmen and the scholars Nonconformists, but if his Lordship were rated for a School Board, as other quarry proprietors were in the adjoining parish, he would pay not £400 a year but £2,200. The schools were vastly inferior, by every educational test, and yet his Lordship, who pocketed £1,600 a year under this arrangement, passed himself off as a very religious man before the whole country because he gave £400 a year. The noble Lord the Member for the Biggleswade Division had said that the fact that Nonconformists sent their children to denominational schools showed that they did not object to their teaching, and the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich had also said something on the same point which he did not quite understand.

LORD HUGH CECIL: It is rather late for me now to discuss my religious convictions.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The noble Lord appears to have approved of the religion taught in the board schools and then to have disapproved of it.

LORD HUGH CECIL: If the hon. Member would read the pamphlet by Canon Moberley he would understand my position better.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I shall be very glad to read it if the noble Lord will send it me. If the noble Lord will read Dr. Clifford's pamphlet I think it would not be an unfair exchange. The noble Lord had said that the religion taught in board schools was not religion at all. How many persons had withdrawn their children from the board schools on the ground of undenominational religious education? The noble Lord had no right to taunt the Nonconformists with the first until he could give the figures of the second. The noble Lord had already pointed out that the danger of limiting the area of selection was that they were bound to get more incompetent men. The right hon. Member for Cambridge University had said that if a teacher was unfit they had the remedy of going to the county authority, but there was a vast chasm between absolute unfitness and great capacity, so that the schools would suffer. There were men of whom it could not be said that they were absolutely unfit, yet they were not men of great capacity. Then they had to face the fact that a man was selected for a different reason. He would quote an advertisement for a teacher from the *Church Times*—

"Wanted, as soon as possible, a schoolmaster, Church of England, lay reader combined; Catholic teaching."

Mr. Lloyd-George.

They might obtain a lay reader who was a good teacher, but he would not be so necessarily; and if Churchmen insisted on the three qualifications here mentioned, the chances were three to one upon getting the services of a good man. This question of the teachers was of first class importance. He knew a Nonconformist School Board, and they had a number of applicants for a position; the best man was a Churchman, and he was selected. If it had been a denominational school, he would not say the teacher selected would not have passed muster, but he would not have been the best man to have been appointed, and the locality would have suffered. Every one who knew the difference that an efficient schoolmaster made would know this. He knew a district where the schoolmaster, in fifteen years, had changed the whole character and complexion of the place and civilised it. It was unfair to the children of the country that they should hamper, embarrass and confine the selection of teachers by any sectarian test. It was surely not necessary for the purpose of preserving religion. If that was so, why could they not agree on a religious teaching which, in the main, was acceptable to all parties? An hon. friend said the other side would not agree. But did not that suggest that the real desire was not to preserve definite religious teaching, but some other object? The mass of the children of the land passed through Sunday schools. There were 800,000 more children in Sunday schools than in day schools. There was the opportunity to give definite religious teaching. There was a residue who did not pass through Sunday schools, but neither did they pass through day schools. Probably not more than 90 per cent. of the children passed through day schools. The balance could not be got at, and the proposed system would not touch them. They were chiefly in the poorer districts, where voluntary schools, as a rule, did not exist, for the simple reason that the resources for their maintenance were not forthcoming. He, therefore, put this point to the Committee for the sake of a population that did not go near either Sunday or day school. For the sake of preserving the rights of the clergy to promotion which they ought never to obtain, education suffered, the children suffered, and our system of education for a whole generation to come would be crippled. It was absolutely unfair.

DR. MACNAMARA said that at present there were 20,000 elementary schools in the country, in 14,000 of which a denominational test existed. The statement of the Leader of the Opposition, made earlier in the debate, that, in addition to that denominational test, demands in regard to extraneous matter were frequently made, which precluded the best men from applying for posts, had been hotly contested by hon. Members opposite. In order to show that where a denominational test existed there was a tendency to look for consideration of other than a purely educational character, he would read a letter from a vicar in answer to an application for a post as head master. [The hon. Member then quoted from a letter, in the course of which the following particulars were asked for—

> "What is your manner in school? Are you a thoroughly good disciplinarian? Do you throw the greatest zest into your religious instruction? What experience have you had in organ playing? I want a really good organist. When have you accompanied Gregorians? What Psalter was it you used? Have you ever accompanied a choral celebration? What voice do you sing? . . . What are your church views? . . . Are you and your wife regular and devout early communicants? What does your family consist of? Has your wife been accustomed to teach sewing? What does she do with this when she is laid up?"]

That was all very well, but where did the children come in? The whole purpose of that correspondence was to get a person who would perform these excellent and desirable Church services efficiently, although at that time the great bulk of the money which would have been spent on the teacher came from public sources. But it was argued that there was now a bargain. What was the "definite asset" which had been put forward? First of all, there was the upkeep of the fabric. The most generous estimate would not put the Church contribution for that purpose at more than 2s. per child per year. Then there was the building. From 1839 to 1882, places were provided in Church elementary schools for 1,200,000 children, at a total cost of £5,750,000, of which £1,250,000 was provided by the State. From 1882 to the present day, 1,700,000 places had been provided in Church schools. No official figures as to cost were available, but going on the basis that 1,200,000 places cost £5,750,000, and allowing for the greater demands of the Board of Education, the increased cost of materials, and the properly enhanced value of labour, the cost might be estimated at £10,500,000. That made a total of £15,000,000 for the building of Church voluntary schools. At 3 per cent. that represented £450,000. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich had put it at £700,000. Even at that figure, what did it mean? The buildings were wanted by the local authority for only six days of five hours out of seven days of twelve hours—considerably less than one-half. Let the local authorities portion of the Church assets for the time they were in the building be taken at £300,000 a year—again a generous estimate. There were 3,000,000 voluntary school children, and the Church was giving value to the extent of £300,000 a year, or 2s. a child. Again, being generous, let it be called 3s., and what had they? First of all the State found the entire maintenance, 55s. per child per year, if the voluntary schools came up to the level of the board schools. The 2s. for repairs and the 3s. for the use of the rooms made a total of 60s., of which 5s. was provided privately. The State, therefore, found eleven-twelfths, and the Church one-twelfth, and yet the latter were to have the whole appointment of the teachers! The demand was unfair and absolutely preposterous. The First Lord of the Treasury said, "We must have these schools, because we intend to perpetuate denominational teaching." The scheme was impossible. He proposed to put the whole cost of that denomination practically upon the public funds, and that could not be done. They had either got to provide public money for all denominations or for none at all. This was practically a provision for one denomination. There were other alternatives which would not in any way militate against the continuance of the denominational system. He had endeavoured to mention this in a scheme in which schools which had hitherto been voluntary schools and board schools would be under public control, while the public authority wanted the buildings. Both schools under the scheme he suggested would begin with a common form of religious worship, which 99 per cent. of the people of this country wanted. They might then easily devise full facilities for the giving of specific denominational teaching to those who wanted it. That would perpetuate denominational teaching without all this fuss about the appointment of teachers. The managers would appoint a head teacher and send in his name to the local education authority. They would say that they had no control over the religious qualifications but they had over the secular, and they might say that the teacher recommended was not the best for the secular instruction, and that they could get plenty better teachers. Consequently they would have many deadlocks. The scheme was bound to break down in practice. Take the case of the School Board for London. They had a perfectly workable system which carried on denominational teaching as hon. Gentlemen opposite desired. They received all applications for teachers, and they went through them and reduced them down to seven for a head teachership. Then they took these seven and selected the three best out of the seven. Then they sent the three names down to the managers, who were permitted to make the final appointment. Why did not the Government try that system? Did they think that the local authority were not people of common sense? Did they think that without going into the plan of testing a person—which was always putting a premium upon hypocrisy—the local authority would not take care to see that the persons they sent down to the managers would be agreeable to them? He knew of School Boards in Scotland who had sent down Roman Catholic teachers to meet the particular needs of a particular case. If they would apply to Father Brennan in London he would tell them that under a public school system they had been able to select teachers quite agreeable to him, and he had said that the system had worked most admirably. He did not know whether a compromise was possible now. They ought to see that the best person was selected from an educational point of view, and they ought not to put a premium on hypocrisy by retaining a denominational test. Why not adopt some such plan as that of the School Board for London, which he thought would be the more practical plan. The plan proposed would lead to great difficulties and would result in an entire breakdown of the denominational system itself.

*MR. LUCAS (Portsmouth) thought it was necessary that somebody should get up to repudiate the statement which had been put forward by the hon. Member for Northampton, that the Government was returned at the general election for the sole purpose of finishing the war in South Africa. He did not propose to further detain the Committee.

(6.18) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (SIR ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 250; Noes, 119. (Division list No. 424.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Colston,CharlesEdw.H.Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratioD(Chatham
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon.Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke,Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes,Hon.Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(WarwickS.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary(St. Albans)
Gordon,Maj.Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirE.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard,John(Kent,F'versh'm
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky,Rt.Hn.WilliamEdw.H.
Lee,Arthur H(Hants.,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney,RtHnW.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Milner,Rt.Hon.SirFrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway, N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Peel,HnWm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley,S.Forde(Bethnal Green)
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild,Hon.Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,HonArthur(Ormskirk
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,SirMark J.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon.Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,ColSirC.EH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams,RtHnJPowell-(Birm.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckett, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur

(6.33) Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 245; Noes 123. (Division List No. 425.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon

Flannery, Sir Fostescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G. R C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh'm
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt Hn. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbt. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hn. Herbert Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beckett, Ernest William
Black, Alexander William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson

Hemphill,Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,William(Carn'rvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorgeSmyth
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Middlemore,JohnThrogmort'n
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton,Captain Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid,SirR. Threshie(Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rothschild,Hon.LionelWalter
Runciman, Walter
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton,John Lawson(Leeds,S.
Warner, Thomas CourtenayT.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley,J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson,Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

*The CHAIRMAN said that the Amendment on the Paper standing in the name of the hon. and learned Member for Dundee—

> "Page 3, line 14, after 'shall,' to insert 'notwithstanding the provisions of any trust deed.'"

was unnecessary and mere surplusage.

(6.50.) Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said that in drafting the Amendment he had followed the precedent set by the right hon. the First Lord of the Treasury himself in an Amendment put down on 30th of July, although he did not know what had become of that Amendment. With all respect to the Chairman he held that his Amendment was not only relevant and usual, but necessary, in order that it should be made perfectly clear that what was in an Act of Parliament was not to be impeded by any legal instrument whatever.

*The CHAIRMAN said that the hon. and learned Member had a better acquaintance with the Law Courts than he had, but he could hardly believe that any Court of Law would decide that a Trust deed was of more force than an Act of Parliament.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY was understood to say that he agreed with the ruling of the Chairman.

Mr. LLOYD MORGAN said he believed the Prime Minister had stated that the question raised by this Amendment had received his consideration, and he hoped that when the right hon. Gentleman came to express his views, he would admit that the Amendment was a reasonable one. It seemed to him that the Amendment followed logically from the earlier part of the Clause, which gave to the local authority power as to the directions to the managers of the non-provided schools. The Amendment was, he submitted, absolutely required for the protection of the teachers. If the teachers could be dismissed without the consent of the local authorities, their position would be very unpleasant and precarious. The letter read by the hon. Member for North Camberwell showed clearly the kind of pressure which could be brought to bear on teachers. A row took place, after a teacher had been appointed, on a matter which had nothing whatever to do with the academic qualifications of the teacher. It might be that, although he was an excellent teacher, and that no kind of objection could be taken to him on academic grounds, he was an independent man, who objected to and refused to discharge duties which had nothing to do with school duties. Difficulties were sure to arise. His Amendment made it necessary that before a teacher could be dismissed the managers must get the consent of the local authority. On general grounds it appeared to him that the Amendment was perfectly fair and reasonable; while it was absolutely essential that the local authority should have this power, otherwise, on a very important particular, the managers might set the local authority at defiance.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 15, after the word 'the,' to insert the words 'dismissal or.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd Morgan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had much sympathy with what he understood to be the object of the hon. Gentleman, but his particular method of carrying out that object was not one which the Government could with propriety or advantage adopt. They must assume now that the Committee had decided, of course after debate and vote, that the denominational character of the schools was to be maintained, that it must be maintained by having teachers qualified to give the denominational teaching, and that the managers, so far as they had to deal with the denominational aspect of the teaching, must do so independently of the education authority. He thought that the hon. Gentleman would see that if his Amendment were introduced into the Bill, it would, as a matter of fact, be impossible to give the denominational managers that control over denominational teaching which they had agreed to give them. Take a concrete instance. Let them suppose the case of a teacher, very highly qualified to give instruction in all matters of secular education, appointed by the managers of a Roman Catholic voluntary school. Suppose that that teacher, while retaining all his qualifications for secular teaching, changed his opinions in regard to religion, and became an avowed Agnostic. He thought the Committee would not desire that the Roman Catholic school should be required to continue the services of this gentleman, but they might be required to do so if the Amendment were carried in the form proposed. The teacher whose imaginary case he was postulating, might appeal to the local education authority, and that authority might say: "We have nothing whatever to do with the denominational character of the teaching; we are instructed by the Act not to withhold our consent to the dismissal of any teacher except on educational—that is secular—grounds; but so far as we are concerned we regard this man as perfectly well qualified to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic, and, therefore, we cannot consent to his dismissal." The result of that would be that the education authority, acting within the limits laid down by this Amendment, would compel the denominational school to retain the services of a teacher whose opinions were violently in conflict with those of the denominational managers and trustees of the school. He did not think the hon. Gentleman desired that. The intention of the hon. Gentleman he understood to be, that if the managers, through caprice, or some mistaken notion of what was good for the secular education of the school, dismissed the teacher, and if the education authority were of opinion that such dismissal would be really injurious to the education of the school, they should have the power to stop it—that up to that point there should be an appeal to the education authority. He thought that that might be very properly granted. It appeared to fall in logically with the scheme of the Bill. The desire of the Government was to increase and strengthen the grip of the education authority on secular education, and this power was evidently in conformity with the general scheme of the scope of the Clause as they had conceived it. But, of course, they must so draw the Amendment that if the dismissal was on religious grounds there should be no right of survey on the part of the education authority. The hon. Gentleman's Amendment could not be accepted in its present form, but he thought it could be accepted if it were moved in this form—after the word "grounds" in the sub-Section to insert the words "and the consent of the authority shall also be required to the dismissal of a teacher, unless the dismissal be on grounds connected with the giving of religious instruction in the school." He thought those words were precise and would carry out the general feeling on both sides of the Committee in favour of some movement in this direction, and hoped the Committee would consent to accept them without any prolonged debate.

DR. MACNAMARA said he had no doubt that the First Lord's Amendment and his speech would be of enormous importance in the schools themselves. He accepted the Amendment, which shut off the religious instruction from the local authority, and he believed it would be a simple act of justice to a very deserving body of public servants. He understood the effect to be that the local authority might veto the dismissal of a teacher unless the dismissal was given on the grounds of religious instruction. He would, however, like to put this point to the right hon. Gentleman. Supposing there was a dismissal nominally in connection with religious instruction, but not actually so—what would happen? Would one of the managers be at liberty to make representation to the local authority, would the local authority then make representation to the Board of Education, and would the Board of Education thereupon be in a position to examine the facts, and, if it should appear that the dismissal was actually on other grounds than those connected with religious instruction, instruct the local authority to set its veto upon that dismissal?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not think the danger apprehended by the hon. Member was conceivable under the new system of management. As he understood the question, it would work out in this way. Let them stretch their imagination and try to conceive such a case—he thought it was an extreme case. What would happen would be that the member of the management body representing the local authority would say to the local authority: "The majority of the managers are pretending to you that this dismissal is upon religious grounds. It is nothing of the kind, but is on grounds quite different." Then he thought it would be in the power of the education authority to veto the dismissal. There would lie an appeal to the Board of Education, not to discuss whether the teacher had or had not done that which was antagonistic to denominational teaching in the school, but to determine the demarcation between that which was connected with religious and that which was connected with secular instruction. The Board of Education would come in as a committee of delimitation.

DR. MACNAMARA expressed his obligations to the right hon. Gentleman, and said he thought his Amendment, with the explanation he had just given, was an entirely satisfactory settlement of the subject.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said he desired to regard the matter from two points of view, the substance of the Amendment and then its form. He was not quite sure that the words of the First Lord of the Treasury were as satisfactory to Members on that side of the House as his hon. friend the Member for North Camberwell seemed to think. What they wanted to secure was that nothing outside the conduct of the school as an elementary school should justify the dismissal of a teacher, and here he would like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education this question. Had the management the right to dismiss a teacher in circumstances which did not touch the education in the school, either religious or secular, during school hours? Could anything which was not done to the satisfaction of the minister of the denomination, either on Sunday or outside school hours entirely, be made the subject-matter of a dismissal? He thought they ought to have some explanation on that point. With regard to the form of the Amendment, he thought it was objectionable, because in his opinion they ought to require the consent of the local authority as a preliminary step to the dismissal of a teacher even more than to his appointment, but here they could have a dismissal first. [Cries of "No."] At least, that was his opinion.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the dismissal could not take place without consent except on religious grounds.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS contended that they could have the dismissal first without consent. Whatever the intention of the Government might be, he thought that the sub-Section should read—"The consent of the local education authority shall be required for the dismissal of a teacher, but such consent shall not be withheld if the dismissal be not on grounds connected with the giving of secular instruction in the school." The other point on which he desired to have an answer was, whether it was perfectly clear that the intention of the Government was that, when once a teacher was appointed, he should not be dismissed if he performed his duty on the secular side and in the denominational teaching of the school.

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said the intention of the words proposed by his right hon. friend was that dismissal should not take place on general grounds without the consent of the local authority, but if the dismissal was on grounds connected with religious instruction there would be no reference to the local authority, and no consent would be required, unless there was a representation from some of the managers that the dismissal was not *bonâ fide* on religious grounds. In such a case there would be a reference back to the managers, and in case of the managers not giving way the matter would go before the Board of Education.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS wished to know if it was clearly understood that religious instruction was to be the instruction given within school hours and not outside the time-table.

MR. H. BROADHURST (Leicester) pointed out that it constantly occurred in rural parishes that the schoolmaster was the best person to act as clerk to the parish council. An energetic clerk of the parish council often came into contact with the managers of the schools. Under this Clause it would be open to the managers to object to the progressive work done by the schoolmaster, and obtain his dismissal upon the ground of incapacity in regard to religious teaching. Village schoolmasters were often also invaluable in friendly society work, and he had known many cases where they would come into conflict with the local managers in that regard. He would like the Amendment drawn in such a way that the managers should not be allowed to dismiss a master unless they had the full sanction of the local authority. It would, in his opinion, be a great misfortune if the local schoolmasters should not be allowed to continue the very useful social work they carried on.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) expressed his entire concurrence with the statement of the Prime Minister, and thanked him for the concession he had made, which, in his opinion, would cover all cases.

*MR. FLETCHER MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston) said it seemed to him that the Prime Minister in his reply had indicated that sub-Section 2 would be kept in such a form that the dismissal of a teacher would come within its provisions. If that were so, he would be perfectly satisfied, because he quite agreed that there must be some provision of that kind. But he was a little afraid that unless the attention of the Committee was called to it, some alteration might take place in the sub-Section which would exclude the matter from its operation.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN said he was prepared, with the sanction of the House, to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

IRELAND — ADMINISTRATION OF THE CRIMES ACT—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

(9.0.) MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork), in rising to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz.—

> "The proclamation, under the provisions of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, of the City of Dublin and of nine Irish counties since the rising of the House in August, and the danger to the public peace arising from the harsh and partisan administration of that Act,"

said: I am sure it is a relief to all of us that we have at last come to the end of the long wrangle as to the right of the representatives of Ireland, without suppression by one English party and without patronage from the other, to have the affairs of their country discussed even for a few hours in a rational manner, instead of our being driven to whatever violent or sporadic means we may be able to find to express our discontent. On my own behalf, Mr. Speaker, and I think I may say on behalf of all my colleagues, I may be allowed to express our deep regret that an unfair portion of the inconvenience of this struggle should have fallen on your shoulders. I will pass from that topic by making an observation which, unfortunately, has a direct bearing on this Motion, and it is to the obstruction which has been offered to this Motion from the first day of these sittings down to the Notice Paper of Friday morning. It is a perfect epitome of the vices and follies of your government of Ireland, which we arraign at this moment, because, as invariably happens in Irish affairs, it turns out that it is we who are in the right, and it is the Government who are wrong. And yet your temper has been tried and our temper has been tried; your business has been obstructed and our business has been obstructed, for the mere pleasure of some puerile dialectical exercitation. As usual, the Irish people have been taught the old lesson that, whatever is not given with grace by this House, must be, and may be, extorted by rougher methods. Under this Motion we have charged the Administration in Ireland with partisanship as well as with hardship. The keynote of that charge—in fact the keynote of all that is occuring in Ireland at the present moment—is to be found in the statement which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary a few weeks ago published in reference to the proposal of Captain Shawe-Taylor for a Land Conference. Here are his words:

> "No Government can settle the Irish Land Question. It must be settled by the parties interested. The extent of useful action on the part of any Government is limited to providing facilities, in so far as that may be possible, for giving effect to any settlement arrived at by the parties."

I venture to say that that is, perhaps, one of the most remarkable confessions that ever fell from the lips of an English Governor of Ireland, and if he had the logic and the courage of his convictions it would be one of the most creditable, because it is a confession of a fundamental truth. The right hon. Gentleman by that statement confessed the powerlessness of any English Government to settle the question which is at the root of all good government in Ireland. He confessed that to effect that settlement is a task which will have to be entrusted to the parties interested—that is to say, to the organisations representing the parties interested, because at this time of day to attempt to ignore these two organisations would be just as if you had tried to terminate the Boer War by opening negotiations between the old women and children on both sides. I am glad to find that *The Times* newspaper, for once in a way, agrees with me in the view of the right hon. Gentleman's statement. *The Times* of this morning says—

> "By giving his blessing to the proposed Conference between Mr. Redmond and Mr. W. O'Brien, on the one hand, and the Duke of Abercorn and Lord Barrymore, on the other, Mr. Wyndham admitted the claim of the United Irish League to be as much officially the organisation of the tenants as the Landowners Convention is of the landlords."

With that declaration of impartiality on his lips he immediately plunges into coercion up to the neck, and for what purpose? In order to gag and persecute one of the parties interested, and that the party that is ready for peace, and to make himself and his Removables and policemen the abject slaves and partisans of the rival combination who will have nothing but war. I ask, Has any English Minister ever more completely given away the case for English rule in Ireland, or more completely condemned his own position? I have no doubt he will say that the settlement was to be effected, not by bitter internecine war, but by friendly agreement between the parties. Yes, but there again he has given away the landlords, and the landlords have given away themselves and him. Because what happened? One of the parties interested, the Tenants' Combination, instantly and unequivocally accepted the peace proposal, the only practical proposition that was made. The governing body of the United Irish League unanimously approved of the Conference, the Irish Parliamentary Party unanimously approved of the Conference, and we did so genuinely and in good faith because we believed, and we believe still, that if the landlords had entered into that Conference in the same spirit as we were prepared to enter into it, it would have been perfectly possible to have arrived at a friendly agreement that would have been acceptable both to landlords and tenants, and, if necessary, without asking the British taxpayers to contribute a single shilling of additional taxation beyond the Imperial expenditure in Ireland at the present moment. If such a Conference had been followed by a Conference between representatives of the two English parties, as Mr. Gladstone, in one of his great inspirations, once suggested, there never was a moment that such astonishingly good results could have been brought about in the way of the appeasement of Ireland. That was the attitude of the tenants; what was the attitude of the landlords? The leaders of the Landowners Convention summarily and insolently rejected these proposals, notwithstanding that, if rumour does not belie him, the right hon. Gentleman took the trouble to travel all the way from County Cork up to Barronscourt in the extreme north, to implore them to save themselves and the country. That was the attitude of the landlords, and now you have the extraordinary result that at this moment it is the men who responded to these peace proposals that are being coerced and persecuted; and it is the gentlemen who scoffed at the right hon. Gentleman's own advice, it is the Landowners' Convention, who by seventy-seven votes to fourteen rejected the proposals of the Conference—these are the men in whose interests the right hon. Gentleman is prostituting the power of England, in order to pander to a clique of selfish territorialists, and play their own selfish game of political intrigue and influence at the expense of certain unfortunate tenants, and at the expense of the people of England, for whom they are laying up a fresh harvest of trouble. That is the right hon. Gentleman's notion of impartiality and statesmanship in the administration of this desperate and exceptional law. We do not forget that it would be unfair to include all the landlords of Ireland in the same breath. There have been some very remarkable developments, and it would be a very shallow and stupid Irishman who would deny that the action of men like Lord Dunraven, the O'Conor Don, Lord Mayo, and Lord Castletown, might be capable of producing results of considerable importance to their own class if they were seconded by a Minister strong enough to grasp the situation, and fearless enough to look to high ideals rather than that of scoring a point, or attempting to do so. These men, undoubtedly, compare not unfavourably in every respect even with those intellectual giants—Lord Londonderry, Lord Ardilaun, and Lord Barrymore—who have hitherto had the courage of their opinions. Unhappily, Lord Dunraven and his friends have to deal with a class—I am afraid with a Ministry—who are not strong enough to stand up to this syndicate of brewers and colliery owners who are rushing the Irish landlords to their ruin. I regret it truly and unfeignedly. If these gentlemen would take a suggestion from me—and I can assure them it is made in no petty or Party spirit—instead of writing letters to *The Times* newspaper to convert gentlemen of the peculiar cerebral formation of Lord Londonderry, they would frankly and honestly join the United Irish League, and trust their own countrymen, within three months they would have settled the Irish Land Question to their own advantage and to the immeasurable advantage of Ireland. We are used to a great many ridiculous misunderstandings in this House and in this country, but there never was a more idiotic notion than the notion that we cling to agitation for the mere love of it. We are ready to act justly and generously, to give more than generous terms to the landlords of Ireland—we do not grudge them, on the contrary, we would welcome them, on the one simple condition, of these landlords recognising that they are Irishmen instead of their playing the part of countryless half-castes, Anglo-Irish Octoroons, who have not at the present moment an atom of power or respect in Ireland and who, I suspect, enjoy very little more respect or love in England. The fault, or perhaps the weakness, on our part is that we have been always too ready to respond to the first genuine touch of kindness. Even the most extreme amongst us are not altogether exempt from the weakness, if I may call it so. Be that as it may, under the present circumstances there is very little fear of even our extremists being subjected to any weakening, because the right hon. Gentleman is proceeding in his government of Ireland upon the principle of persecuting the men who are reconcilable and who are in the right, in the interest of the men who are irreconcilable and who are in the wrong.

What are the crimes for which the right hon. Gentleman has placed Dublin and these nine counties under such severe disabilities and degradations? The first fact that I would ask the House to bear in mind is that, broadly speaking, there is no real agrarian crime in Ireland—nothing except the technical crime of free speech, which has been created by the Coercion Act, and which even a Unionist so irrational as your own County Court Judge O'Connor Morris has confessed to be free from moral blame. If Englishmen only took the pains of going through the statistics of the present time in Ireland and compared them with the state of bloodshed and terror in reference to which other Coercion Acts were proposed, I am convinced that even the bitterest of our English opponents would feel humiliated and ashamed that proceedings so tyrannical should be put in force in a country from which crime has been so absolutely absent. If the Government had attempted to pass the Coercion Act through Parliament this session, with even their ironclad majority of 130, they could not have got the Bill through the House; and I venture to say there is no Minister on the Treasury Bench who would be case-hardened enough to propose it, knowing how utterly destitute were the materials to justify it. At *The Times* Forgeries Commission evidence was given that there had been eighty-seven agrarian murders during the three years of the Land League, in spite of the heroic efforts of Michael Davitt to avert them. The United Irish League has been four and a half years in existence, and during those years there has been just one agrarian murder in the whole country, and that took place three years ago, and it did not take place in the province of Connaught, where alone at that time the United Irish League was in existence. When the Liberal Government were proposing the Coercion Act of 1882 they produced statistics showing that there had been 9,023 agrarian outrages from 1879 to 1882. I have got here the latest quarterly Return of agrarian crime in Ireland, and it is like a certain famous history of snakes in Ireland. Snakes there are none! Except a few threatening letters, there are only twenty-one petty agrarian offences returned in the whole country for three months. Under all the important headings there are long columns of blanks from many counties, and from whole provinces. It is exactly the same story in what are called the disturbed counties. Not a single crime of any sort; nothing that even the imagination of Dublin Castle could dress up and represent as a crime in the ordinary sense of the word, except threatening letters, of which I myself in this House have received in a single night as many as have been charged against the whole people of Ireland. I have no grievance against the threatening letter writers, except when they forget to pay the postage. It is not as if we made these representations about the state of Ireland. I have referred to your reports. Let me now refer to a still better witness. On the 14th March, in this House, the Chief Secretary stated, much to his credit, "Therefore, I have always held it my duty to say that of violent crime against the person or property in Ireland, there is less now than in any period of which we have record." Well, grossly though the people have been exasperated, I do not think that it will be pretended that any serious change has taken place since, except, as the House heard today, that no less than five county jails in Ireland have since been closed for want of any ordinary criminals to occupy them. This is the country in which the right hon. Gentleman has proclaimed the City of Dublin and nine other counties—this is the country in which you are attacking Members of Parliament, your own colleagues in this House, more savagely than you sometimes treat your wife-beaters and garrotters in England. This is the country in which, I venture to say, within the last twelve months you have attacked more newspapers—you who love the freedom of the Press—for reporting Irish meetings than have been suppressed in Russia during the same period—a period of exceptional danger to Russia, and I know what I am talking about perhaps a little better than the yellow journals who are so fond of giving the Czar a lesson on constitutional matters.

There is another point. It is not you, but these very Members of Parliament, and these very newspapers and this organisation that you have attacked, that have got rid of agrarian crime in Ireland. You could not do it. For the one crime you ever put down you create a hundred. The agents of Dublin Castle are themselves the worst disturbers, and very often the worst criminals, and yet, as I told the House the other night of a police crime, which, if it had succeeded, would have covered the reputation of this Party and organisation with mire and blood, you heard the Attorney General for Ireland really arguing as if the criminal were not the police forger but the man who, in defence of his own honour and the honour of the country against one of the foulest wrongs ever attempted, inconvenienced Dublin Castle by attempting to bring that man to justice. We have given you a country absolutely free from bloodshed or from any deeds which shun the daylight. You are dealing now, not with a country of moonlighters, but with a country of broad daylighters, thanks to the teaching of the United Irish League. This organisation has now for nearly five years been in operation, every year with decreasing agrarian statistics, and in all that time our watchful enemies in Dublin Castle and the landlord camp have never been able to fasten upon a single deed of bloodshed which by any perversity of malice could be traced to the teachings of our organisation. There is no fathoming the infatuation of English rule in Ireland. A wise English statesman would frankly and honestly acknowledge the work of the League. It may literally be stated that adjectives, strong adjectives, have been substituted for bullets in agrarian controversy. A wise statesman would go down on his knees and thank his stars that the Irish people have been brought to look upon peaceful and combined public action in the open day instead of looking to the blunderbuss and to the midnight outrage for weapons of agitation.

What has been the statesmanship of the right hon. Gentleman, or rather of the Landowners' Convention, whom he has ignobly, for a man of his admitted mental stature, permitted to run the show, and to pull the strings, and to direct his performance? The men behind him have been striving to wrest from the people the weapons of open and legitimate agitation; they have been trying to persuade the people that an editor or Member of Parliament who fearlessly speaks out public opinion is doing a more dangerous thing for himself, and, perhaps, a more ineffectual thing, than the man who would fire at a landlord from behind a ditch. These men know that the absence of crime is our strength and their weakness, and horrible as it undoubtedly is to have to say it, I say deliberately these men are longing for crime, and working for crime, because they know it is their only hope of putting down the public opinion of their countrymen, and of arousing English prejudice and passion against us. Anyone knows that crime would be our ruin. The House has heard a good deal about County Court Judge Curran, the gentleman who threw in the face of twenty-three grand jurors their resolution referring to the peaceful condition of the county. That gentleman in passing a sentence of hard labour upon one of our colleagues, made this remarkable and eloquent statement—

> "I have some experience of the terrible crime of boycotting in other times, and I deliberately say that as the result of that experience I should far prefer going back to the times when there would be a calendar containing twenty or thirty cases of serious crime, ordinary crime, than to see systematic boycotting practised in any county."

That is to say, this gentleman would be happier if there were twenty or thirty cases of murder or midnight outrage, instead of the state of things in which the people are peacefully combining to deal with their friends instead of dealing with their enemies. I know how difficult it is to criticise this gentleman's conduct. The Prime Minister declined to give the House an opportunity of doing so. I do not desire to say anything particularly unfriendly of Judge Curran, owing to his earlier life, but I am sorry for him, and all I can say is, if I had read that statement anonymously, I should have thought it a statement more worthy of a ghoul than of a Judge.

Now, what are those terrible crimes for which practically you have put an end to trial by jury and to freedom of the Press, and have been carrying on all these savageries against your own colleagues in this House? I hope I have shown that it is not really agrarian crimes you are dealing with, as of old. It is not a strike against rent, as of old. There is absolutely no trace of a rent strike in any part of the county outside the immediate neighbourhood of the De Freyne estate, where it arose out of peculiar and sad local circumstances and without consultation with the governing body of the United Irish League ["Oh"]. Who is the Gentleman opposite who interrupts?

MR. ARCHDALE (Fermanagh, N.): Is the hon. Member for East Mayo not one of the governing body?

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: The hon. Member for East Mayo will be mighty well able to speak for himself. I assert most distinctly that in no way whatever was the governing body of the League consulted.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): Then why am I attacked?

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I would refer the hon. Gentleman to his own constituents, who, I think, will inform him that the English House of Commons is not the proper place for an altercation among men calling themselves Irishmen. For myself, the first whisper I heard of the fight on the De Freyne estate was when I was 12,000 miles away, and in a speech in which the right hon. the Chief Secretary charged me with having organised it. I invited the right hon. Gentleman in this House, and I invite him now, to cite from any of the four or five hundred speeches I have delivered in the course of this fight, a single sentence in which I countenanced non-payment of rent as a weapon in this agitation, and certainly I do not claim to be gifted with the talent of concealing my thoughts through so long a series of speeches. No, Sir, you have no crime to deal with, no no-rent strike to deal with, and I venture to say to this House that the only crime of any kind against which this Act is directed is the crime of free speech and of free newspaper writing, based on the principle of trade union law in England, and asserting the right of exclusive dealing.

I am afraid of absorbing an unfair proportion of the time available for this miserably restricted debate, or I should be glad to quote the strongest of the speeches that have been made the basis of charges against my colleagues. I suppose I may safely leave that task to the Chief Secretary, and I ask the House to watch those speeches, and to see for themselves if this were a question of a big miners' strike in England, or a big dockers' strike in London, whether any one of those speeches would have attracted any particular attention in England if it were delivered at an English Trade Union Congress. There is an easy test. Lord Londonderry is a colliery owner in England, as well as a leader of the land war in Ireland. If there were a strike of his miners in England I should like to see Lord Londonderry and his colleagues facing the working men of England at a General Election, I should like to see the Prime Minister of England facing the working men of Manchester, or the Member for West Birmingham facing the working men of Birmingham, if for speeches of that character to the strikers in England, men of honour and noble lives like the Member for Morpeth and the Member for Battersea had been treated as our colleagues have been treated—had been treated with the same cowardly and beastly violence and foul play.

Now we come to the proclamation of Dublin. Today the right hon. Gentleman, with a candour on which, I must say, I compliment him, made to this House the astonishing confession that the city of Dublin, the capital of the country, had been proclaimed under this frightful Act, for no other reason under the sun except to enable him to deal with the *Irish People* newspaper. I congratulate him on his candour and thank him for its gigantic advertisement; but I ask the House was there ever such a declaration made by a Minister before, as that the capital city of a country, counting with its suburbs something like 500,000 inhabitants, should be stripped of the right of trial by jury and reduced to a state of minor siege in order to deal with a humble weekly newspaper? An hon. Member opposite interrupted me just now when I was referring to the Member for West Birmingham. There are two Members for West Birmingham — the Member of the present and the Member of the past. I would ask the hon. Member opposite just to fancy the Birmingham of old times being proclaimed under this Act and being stripped of the right of trial by jury, in order to get at a weekly newspaper in Birmingham, or even at the *Birmingham Daily Post*, for publishing the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, the speeches of those old, old times of his Radical, or rather of his Republican, days when we are assured on high authority that he was preaching the doctrines of Jack Cade. No, Mr. Speaker, Birmingham is not to be proclaimed, though Dublin is a very much more peaceful city than Birmingham, as I think the hon. Member for Carnarvon can testify.

I have something else to say to the House, and I will not waste the time of the House [some MINISTERIAL cheers, and Irish cries of "Order" and "The gentlemen of England!"] I can only attribute that interruption to what the French call "inferior mentality." I will not waste the time at my disposal by dealing with the three or four trumpery paragraphs denouncing landgrabbing, for which the *Irish People* was prosecuted. I am sure that the Chief Secretary will make up for the deficiency, and will read those paragraphs in full, and I ask the House as soon as they have heard them to say if ever there was a more ridiculous mouse produced than that which the Government had produced, after putting a mountain in labour and after reducing a city of half a million of inhabitants to slavery. We accuse the Government in this Motion of harshness, as well as of partisanship—harshness is the very meekest word that I could find in the dictionary. We do not intend to make any appeal to this House in reference to the brutal way, the blackguardly way, in which these Coercion Courts have been conducted. The more those courts are conducted in that manner the sooner will any decent Englishman be revolted at them. Do not for a moment think that we on these Benches want to be one whit better treated than the humblest man who appears before those courts for taking our advice—I mean, of course the advice we really do give, not the hideous caricature of that advice that passes current with the Party of invincible ignorance on the other side of the House. I only mean invincible ignorance as to the affairs of Ireland which they will persist in running into. If the expression of public opinion is to be a crime, by all means do not spare us. On the contrary, I felicitate the Government upon having the courage of their convictions, and upon treating the representatives of Ireland with more brutality even than you are treating the people. You are now laying down as your principle of government that the more faithful and fearless a representative of the people is, the heavier will be his crime and the heavier will be your disgusting punishment. That is your pretty theory of constitutional Government in the twentieth century, and you are surprised that a race of 20,000,000 do not kiss the rod and do not bow down and worship and love you.

In the old times, before you passed the Local Government Bill in 1892, you fell back upon the empty cry that the elected representatives of Ireland were not the true representatives of the people. Even so late as last Saturday I saw in the newspaper that Lord Cadogan had made a speech with some questionable taste, knowing as he well must, that if he had made that speech the day before he quitted Dublin the men he had used for his own purposes had only to raise their hands, and he would have been hooted through Dublin to the ship's side. But by your own Local Government Act you have blown Lord Cadogan's ideas sky high. In the local councils of Ireland there is as intensely localised a representation of the people as it would be possible to have, and what is the consequence? In 30 out of 32 counties you have been forced to make war on the County Councils and the District Councils, just as you are making war on the Irish representatives. It is a war directed not so much against Members of Parliament, whom you cannot disqualify and dare not expel, but against the local representatives of the people—a war to intimidate the men who have carried on a system of local administration so excellent that the Local Government Board, hostile as it is, has borne testimony to its good work. Instead of honestly confessing that you have the people of Ireland against you, instead of admitting that all Irish representatives in every shape and category, in Parliament, in corporations, in district and county councils, are against you, your brilliant idea is to try to terrorise by these disabilities and these disgusting torments of public men—in order to drive from public life the men whose character and public spirit would be the treasure and security for the good government of any other country on the face of the earth.

The treatment of these men is opposed to the usages of civilisation. Englishmen have been political prisoners before now. I am not speaking of the Jameson raid, with reference to which incident the right hon. Gentleman hawked a begging letter round the House. When the right hon. Gentleman remembers, the way he is treating Irish Members, let him not forget how they enabled him to secure civilised treatment for his own friends. I do not envy the right hon. Gentleman's feelings when he reflects that at this moment some of the men who signed that petition at his request are now lying on plank beds under his orders. But Dr. Jameson was not merely the prisoner of this country; he was the prisoner of President Kruger, whom hon. Members opposite are accustomed to abuse. Was Dr. Jameson stretched on a plank bed, or was he hanged by the neck from the nearest tree, as Mr. Kruger would have been justified in doing by every canon of international law? English soldiers and officers in thousands fell into the hands of those poor, rude, uncultured, peasant farmers in South Africa, and they knew what Boer prisons were like. No doubt the English soldiers had to rough it and to put up with a good deal of discomfort; but I ask them to say whether they were treated by their Boer gaolers as the Irish Members are being treated by the Chief Secretary in Ireland. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Question, question."] Irish Members, after all, have feelings as well as the officers of the Imperial Yeomanry, and I ask what would hon. Gentlemen opposite think if they had been treated by the Boer Generals as the right hon. Gentleman's gaolers have treated an hon. friend of mine who is sitting on these Benches at this moment not far from me—I will not name him, because it is a matter too horrible for the ears of civilisation. A member of the Irish Party has been sentenced for a speech to his constituents, and he has been ordered into the prison wash-house and invited to wash the underclothing of abandoned women from a neighbouring ward. [Some MINISTERIAL laughter, and Irish cries of "Shame," "Only a cad could laugh," and "Cecil."] The hon. Member who laughs is not worthy to unloose the latchet of the shoe of the man to whom I have referred, and I pity the England that can produce a noble Lord that can jeer at such a circumstance. It is one of those things almost too horrible to mention, one of the things from which history loves to avert its gaze. But this is the way in which the Government are vindicating the glory and humanity of England against the Irish Members. What were the offences for which these two sets of men found themselves in prison? I do not want to say anything against the soldiers, who, of course, only obeyed orders. The Government entered upon the Transvaal war in order to plunder the Boers of their gold. [Cries of "Order."]

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is speaking of subjects outside the question before the House.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I was only going to point out that as far as the men who are imprisoned under this Act are concerned, their one crime is that they strove to preserve some remnants of the population of their own country, which is less within the last ten years by some 430,000 of the very flower of the inhabitants. Those who live in this rich country cannot imagine the feelings of Irishmen when they see the population in Ireland wasting away like a consumptive patient, coughing away its life every week, and who feel that unless something heroic is done it may be too late. The Chief Secretary may have a brilliant career before him, but up to the present his only achievement in Ireland has been to invent a new way of stretching his political opponents on the rack, a war from which the present Prime Minister shrunk under the old Coercion Act. The right hon. Gentleman read out the other day a list of 1,200 sentences of hard labour under the old Coercion Act, but in nearly all those cases they were directed against instances of resistance to the police and to the bailiffs, none of which are taking place at the present moment, while as to the large number of Members of Parliament, priests, and editors of newspapers who were prosecuted then, only the merest insignificant fraction of them were sentenced to hard labour. I should be very sorry for one moment to suggest that the right hon. Gentleman derives any pleasure from sending his colleagues to hard labour, but it will not do for the Chief Secretary, as he did this afternoon, to state that it is not by his orders, and that he has not given any directions to these removable magistrates. Who ever suspected Dublin Castle of doing anything as clumsy as that? But mark this fact. These removable magistrates suddenly began to pass sentences of hard labour the moment the cue was given them, and every man in Ireland knows thoroughly well that, at one word of reprobation of this savagery from the right hon. Gentleman, his miserable creatures would drop their new plan of campaign just as quickly as they took it up. Some of the resident magistrates are honourable men, but most of them are creatures who are as amenable as the right hon. Gentleman's valet to his slightest word.

These proceedings are only worthy of your concentration camps in South Africa. But we have no appeal to make to you. These things degrade and disgrace you and not us, and you are only in the beginning of them. I could have quoted to you what happened to my hon. friend the Member for North Longford, who was sentenced to two months hard labour for publishing reports of the branches of the United Irish League. You remember his answer when he was told that the sentence of hard labour would be dropped if he undertook to refrain from such conduct. Do you suppose that you are going to frighten him by hard labour? Will you frighten the hon. Member for South Mayo, who was not frightened by your policemen who pulled him down, without a shadow of legal right, by brute force, and pulled him off every platform from which he attempted to address his own constituency? Do you suppose you will frighten my hon. friend the Member for East Galway, who will be face to face with a sentence of four months hard labour? You may torture these men, you may kill them, and you will kill them if you go on in this way. These hon. Members have announced that they will risk their lives in resisting your prison treatment. Any man who knows the hon Member for North Longford and the hon. Member for East Galway knows that when they pledge their lives they mean what they say. Do you think you will dishonour my hon. friend the Member for East Galway in the eyes of the Irish people, for whom he has already given up the greater part of his noble and unselfish life? Do you think you are going to frighten the local bodies of the country? No; these bodies have only at any moment to cease holding their meetings, and they would land the Government in chaos and paralysis. They are not in a hurry to be driven to such steps, but they could do it, and if they are driven to it they will do it. The right hon. Gentleman has had a great opportunity in Ireland, and has still, for we never nourish a personal grudge against any man who will do good work for Ireland.

Tomorrow, or the day after, a great many of us will be going back to Ireland, and it will be for this House to send us back with a message of peace or war. With the Government will be the responsibility, and, sooner or later, with them will be the retribution. If you send us back with the message that this House has no sympathy for the people you persist in governing against their will, and who have never done you any wrong and upon whom you have inflicted centuries of almost uninterrupted cruelty and wrong, yours will be the responsibility. The Irish people may be beaten down by the force of England, but they have never been beaten down for long. Cromwell could not do it, and I do not think that even the right hon. Gentleman's rashest flatterer would suggest that he is likely to succeed where Cromwell failed. The attitude of the Irish Party and of the Irish people towards our enemies in this House, or out of it, may be summed up in a rough and ready way in a couplet which is familiar to us in Ireland, in which the stalwart peasants of Tipperary are made to say to their landlords:

> "We have a hand for the grasp of friendship, and another to make you quake,
> And you are welcome to whichsoever it pleases you most to take."

(10.15.) CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.) said that after the exhaustive and powerful speech which his hon. friend had delivered it was not necessary for him to go into detail in seconding this Motion. It would be generally agreed that a more powerful indictment of the Government had never been presented to this House. He felt sure that many hon. Members sitting in different quarters of the House who had listened to the speech just delivered could not but feel ashamed of the coercion policy at present pursued in Ireland, and of the brutalities at present being perpetrated upon their political opponents and the public men of that country. He ventured to think that even English Conservative Members could not fail to recognise that the existing situation in Ireland was a disgrace to England. It was difficult for any one who did not reside in a proclaimed district in Ireland thoroughly to understand the conditions of life which prevailed there and under which the people had at present to live. Not only were public men flung into gaol for asserting the right of free speech, but members of public bodies were unable to transact the business of the boards to which they belonged without being compelled to pass through rows of policemen stationed at the doors, who entered their names in note-books, just as if those public men were bent upon some desperate enterprise. Within the past fortnight he had attended a business meeting in the board room of one of the unions in his constituency. On entering the gates of the workhouse he passed through files of police, stationed there for the purpose of entering the names in their books of his friends and himself, just as if they were ticket-of-leave men. He wondered how long the English people would submit to insults of that character. He would ask hon. Members to turn this matter over in their minds, and put themselves in his place and the place of his colleagues. One would imagine that the Unionist policy would be a policy of conciliation, and that an attempt would at least be made to cultivate good relations between the two countries, but apparently the policy, at least of the present Unionist Government, was as far as possible to widen the chasm between them. What greater outrage could be inflicted on any people than to heap insults on their elected representatives? It appeared to him to be the deliberate aim and object of the present Government to heap every species of indignity and insult upon the Irish Nationalist representatives in their own country. Irish Nationalist Members were sent to pick oakum, and in this country they were targets almost daily of the vilest abuse from the so-called Unionist Press. He regretted to say that the abuse was not confined to the Unionist Press, for within the past two days the late Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, who was always treated with the utmost courtesy by the Irish Members, joined in the chorus. It surely must at length be apparent to the English people that the present situation in Ireland was impossible. He ventured to say that the sooner the British electors recognised that no country could be constitutionally governed against the will of the vast majority of the people, the sooner would they adopt the only possible remedy of Home Rule for Ireland. He begged to second the Motion.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. William O'Brien.*)

(10.23.) MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said the debate tonight was worthy of somewhat more respectful attention than some, at least, of the hon. Gentlemen below the gangway on the Ministerial side had given to it. He rather regretted that some of the younger Members opposite thought it desirable to interrupt his hon. friend with observations which were not worthy of them, the House, or the subject. Though this was a very serious and violent question, he wished, so far as he could, to give the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary no provocation to choose the worse instead of the better way of dealing with the Irish problem. His own opinion of the present situation in Ireland, whatever the right hon. Gentleman or anybody else might say, was that they were nearing the close of the land struggle in that country, if the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues were equal to the situation. The landlords and the tenants were approaching each other by stress of circumstances, and the right hon. Gentleman therefore had the opportunity, which no Statesman who was responsible for the government of Ireland ever had before, of dealing with the question with everything in his favour. But if the right hon. Gentleman wished to clear the way for this settlement of the Land Question for ever, he was going in the very worst way about doing it by his policy. If the right hon. Gentleman proceeded on the sinister path of coercion he would produce a state of feeling in Ireland, and in England as well, which would make it almost impossible for him, or for any Government, to deal with the Land Question in a large and statesmanlike way. Their complaint against the right hon. Gentleman was that his administration of the Coercion Act was partisan—that it was used in the interests of one great class in a class war. What would have been said of President Roosevelt if, at the very moment when he was trying to produce reconciliation in connection with the great coal strike he had proclaimed the organisation of the miners, and proceeded by officers dependent on the Executive Government, instead of by independent judges to try the leaders in special courts, and to send them to prison? What would have been said of the leaders of the capitalists on the other side if they had insisted on the insane and childish policy of the landlord party in Ireland, and had refused to meet Mr. Mitchell and the other leaders of the workmen on the ground that they were not representative of the miners' organisation? The right hon. Gentleman had said that he gave no directions to the resident magistrates. It was not necessary that he should. What was their position? They could be removed, promoted, dismissed, or pensioned by the right hon. Gentleman. They were absolutely at his mercy. With regard to sentences, he thought the right hon. Gentleman had improved upon the Chief Secretary in the administration of coercion. He did not know whether the House understood what was meant by the addition of hard labour to the sentences which were passed now. The meaning was that if a district councillor were sentenced to hard labour he was for five years debarred from serving his country as a member of those Boards. Was it statesmanship to exclude from the Government of Ireland the most trusted and respected leaders of the people—those men who had gained encomium even from a hostile Local Government Board? He had the honour of being a member of the Select Committee of this House which a few years ago dealt with the whole question of the prison treatment of this country and of Ireland. That Committee had the honour of abolishing the system of starvation which existed in the prisons of England and Ireland. They endeavoured to make the distinction which was made in every civilised country in the world between political and ordinary prisoners. Was there any country where it was not made except this? He was going to say Russia, but it was made in Russia to an extent that very few people knew. Transportation to Siberia for political offences, which was deprecated as something beyond human endurance, was a far better fate than being sent to several years penal servitude. It was reserved for England, which claimed to stand in the van of civilisation and humanity, to treat political prisoners in a manner unknown to the despotism of Russia. He was sorry to see hon. Members opposite burst into laughter when the prison treatment of political offenders in Ireland was described. He should have thought that the ferocious attempts which were being made to degrade political opponents would have made every decent Englishman blush. During this great war which had recently been closed thousands of Englishmen were treated with the utmost humanity by the manly and courageous foe with whom they were dealing, and he thought that Irishmen had a right to ask that their countrymen should be as well treated by the British Government as the Boers treated British prisoners. There were hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House who brought the petition in favour of the better treatment of the participants in the Jameson Raid to the Nationalist Benches. Was it consistent that these very hon. Gentlemen should now cheer the Minister who refused to distinguish between political and other prisoners in Ireland? Some of the sentences which had been passed were savage and unworthy of any Government. Hon. Gentlemen opposite might complain that some of the language from the Nationalist Benches had been hot and strong, but he should like to know how, if they had come from imprisonment with the plank bed and bread-and-water diet, they would feel if a Liberal Government were to debar them from the opportunity of making the facts known. He had no doubt the right hon. Gentleman desired to settle the Irish Land Question if he had an opportunity of doing so. He hoped and prayed that the right hon. Gentleman would now avail himself of the opportunity which had presented itself for carrying out a right land policy and of closing the struggle of centuries. He asked him to turn away from the dark and sinister paths of coercion.

(10.40.) MR. TULLY said there had not been a Coercion Act passed in Ireland for the last twenty-five years where he was not one of the first to be taken up under it. When the right hon. Gentleman came to Ireland and issued his first Crimes Act summons, it was against him it was issued. He wished to protest not only against the proclamation of nine counties, but against the mean, underhand manner in which the operations of the Crimes Act had been extended by the Chief Secretary and his colleagues on the Front Bench. Section 2, sub-Section 8, was one of the most dangerous provisions in the Crimes Act. It dealt with cases of unlawful assemblies. Owing to the action of the right hon. Gentleman, and he supposed the Attorney-General, that sub-Section had now been extended to every part of Ireland without any proclamation, and without any notice being given in this House. The old legal writers held that an unlawful assembly should be one that would create terror and fear to His Majesty's subjects, but owing to the refinements of lawyers and judges in Dublin this had now been extended to attending assemblies which were perfectly peaceful, and at which no riot and nothing exciting fear or terror occurred. At first it was held that if a person took part in an unlawful assembly he should do so knowingly or unlawfully, but the law had been extended so that the mere fact of being present at a meeting in Ireland brought a man within the meshes of the Crimes Act. It had been decided by the Lord Chief Baron that under Section 2 of the Crimes Act such a meeting as he had described was an unlawful assembly, and that anyone taking part in that assembly was knowingly taking part in it. That was how the law had been strained and extended in Ireland in a mean and underhand manner. What happened in his own case? He attended an ordinary cross-roads meeting on a Sunday. It was sworn by the police officers that the meeting was perfectly peaceable, that there was no riot, or anything tending to excite fear or terror among His Majesty's subjects. The Crimes Act had not been proclaimed in the district, and no notice had been given to anybody that the meeting should not be held. Yet he was dragged before two removable magistrates for attending and speaking at it. The judges in Dublin decided that the Chairman's speech was legal, that the resolutions were legal, that the speech of the man who spoke before him was legal, and that they could not point to a single sentence in his speech which was illegal. In fact, it was not half as strong as some of the speeches he had made in the House. But because two other gentlemen made speeches, which he himself did not hear, the meeting was declared to be an unlawful assembly. [Laughter from the MINISTERIAL Benches.] The judges declared that they could not split an assembly up into compartments. [Renewed laughter.] That might be very funny to hon. Gentlemen opposite, but he had to lie on a plank bed for it. That was the law as laid down in Ireland dealing with every meeting, even County Council and District Council meetings, where any man got up and made a strong speech; any man who took part in such a meeting could be tried, as he was, by removable magistrates, and packed off to the nearest prison. What he complained of was that the second section of the Crimes Act had been construed in a mean and insidious manner. The hon. Member for Cork and the hon. Member for Scotland Division of Liverpool had now taken up the very attitude for which he had been ostracised and denounced. They had come round, in fact, to his way of thinking. He did not wish to embitter this matter, but he had been denounced for publishing a letter suggesting a conference on the De Freyne estate, a conference which he knew would have been successful, and would have saved the tenants all the law costs and ruin which had fallen upon them; and a conference which would have led to a large number of these tenants being now on their way to become peasant proprietors. Because he would not give the name of the writer of that letter, he had been denounced in the most scandalous manner. He was glad to think that the hon. Member for Cork had now accepted his views in regard to the conference. He hoped the Chief Secretary would give up his policy of coercion and would deal with the land question. If the land question in Ireland was to be settled, it could only be so on a fair basis that would give to the landlords as much for their investments of the price of their property as they were now getting from their rents, and which would enable the tenants to obtain their land on the same terms as they would get it by voluntary purchase. It was said that the landlords were willing to accept twenty-seven years purchase, and that the average tenants were paying, by voluntary agreement, eighteen and a half years purchase for their holdings. He understood that the rent-roll of Ireland at the present moment was between seven and eight millions. The difference between twenty-seven years purchase and eighteen and a half years purchase would be about fifty-six millions. That fifty-six millions could easily be saved by abolishing the Land Commission, and reducing the bloated strength of the constabulary in Ireland, and the whole thing could be carried out without the loss of a farthing to the British Exchequer. He supported this Motion because he was always against coercion, he did not care from what quarter it came. He had been put in prison by Liberals as well as by Tories, and had been coerced in every quarter of the House, although he had always managed to survive.

(10.55.) THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I do not rise either to re-argue the legal points involved in the case which led to the hon. Member's being sentenced to a term of imprisonment, or to confirm or dispute his anticipations of the details of the solution of the land question which he believes will put an end to all future troubles in respect to the land in Ireland. I know everybody nowadays has a solution of the land question in his pocket; and, indeed, I can say quite sincerely I think we are nearer a solution than we have ever been before. Sir, I rise to answer a sweeping indictment which has been brought against the Government. The major parts of all the speeches to which we have listened have consisted in a charge that the Government, and myself as the Minister responsible to this House, have instituted in Ireland unjustifiable and partisan prosecutions; that the persons who have been found guilty before the tribunals in Ireland have, owing to the administration of the Criminal Law and Procedure Act, had less than justice, and during their incarceration they have not received that humane treatment which, I suppose, they should have received had the general prisons rules been properly administered. Well, that was a sweeping indictment. But hon. Members were good enough to suggest the line of my defence. It was very obliging of them to challenge me to read out three paragraphs in one newspaper on which I founded the recent action taken by the Irish Government. Sir, my defence will not consist in reading out this or that paragraph from a newspaper, or this or that passage from a speech. My defence, if I have time to develop it, will consist in showing there has been a steady, persistent, and deliberate encroachment upon liberty in Ireland; that the Government, after long delay, and perhaps after undue reluctance, have taken the steps which in their opinion were necessary if the existing system of land laws, or any other system of land laws, in Ireland is ever to have a fair chance to assist that country.

But I cannot pass altogether by a certain note which was sounded more than once in the speeches to which we have listened. The hon. Member who moved the Adjournment concluded his speech by asking whether he and those who sit with him were to be sent back to Ireland with a message of peace or of war. The hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool re-echoed that language. They seemed to indicate that we were at a parting of the way. The words "peace" and "war" came again and again into the speech of the mover of the Adjournment of the House. He charged one set of Irishmen with being in favour of war, and another set of Irishmen, including himself, he credited with a desire for peace. I have often, I hope not in a priggish or pedantic way, deprecated the importation of these military terms into the discussion of economic and constitutional questions. But there are, I suppose, some civil contentions to which the terms of war may aptly be applied. In Ireland we talk of the land war when we speak of the land; but, whether in respect of actual warfare or in respect of such civil contentions, I have always found that those who have most personal experience either of actual warfare or of such contentions are the slowest to begin war, because they know what the cost of war is. Just because they do know, they hold it right when this course has been undertaken to see that value has been received from it, and the men who are slowest to begin war are found to be the slowest to make peace. In the first period, they are unpopular with the war party, and in the second period, they are unpopular with the peace party; but I think they are right all through. There is room for diplomacy before the outbreak of war; there is room for sentiment after the conclusion of peace; but between these two epochs there is, I deeply regret to say, room only for fighting. Fighting must go on until the question has been determined one way or the other.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: That is an extremely foolish observation.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Be it so.

MR. CREAN (Cork Co., S.E.): We accept the challenge.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Go on.

MR. WYNDHAM: That is so. Nor do I think what I have said points by any means to the necessity of war. What is the question at issue? In our opinion it is a simple one. Our contention has been one of one point alone—that intimidation ought not to be used in order to coerce people into courses, good, bad, or indifferent, from which they have a right to refrain. We contend that it is used in Ireland, that it is used for an object which inflicts injury, not only on the immediate victims of such intimidation but on the general welfare of the Irish nation; and, in any case, we contend that such intimidation is illegal, and consequently that those who are guilty of using it for this purpose ought to be made amenable to the law. But the contention of hon. Members is not simple; it is complex, and even confused. Whereas some of them speak, as hon. Members have spoken tonight, of insisting on the necessity of passing some large measure of land purchase which would enable the tenant to own the holding he now occupies without the delay adequate for that purpose, others say that all the great grazing ranches ought to be split up and distributed. Stated in that extreme fashion, it is an economic absurdity and legislative impossibility. There may be room, there ought to be room, for working into any general Bill for land purchase, as a subordinate corollary, facilities for dealing with congestion wherever it exists, for not selling a holding to anyone who is to be a debtor to the State and who cannot count upon making a livelihood. But there is a third section of opinion, and I could quote sheaves of speeches to prove it, who state that the object of this land movement is not a solution of the land question, but that it is necessary to expel what they call the British garrison. These are not the great titled noblemen, but some of them are themselves farmers who came forty or fifty years ago from England, and some men who came from England in the time of Cromwell. These men are to be expelled from Irish soil. Then there is the fourth school of thought, if that is the proper phrase, who seem to think that this question ought to be used, not in order to settle the land question, which, I think should be done, but to render Government in Ireland impossible. That, again, is subdivided into minor classes, some of which, if we are to judge from the Roscrea case, hold that tenancies in towns ought not to be determined according to the ordinary process of law. And there are some who advocate that in towns all shopkeepers ought to be boycotted who will not join a particular political organisation. There are others who advocate openly that through the length and breadth of Ireland, local boards who have received great power under the Local Government Act should give their contracts, not to the lowest tender, but to the highest tender if the person who tenders belongs to the political organisation. I do not rehearse these different views in order to bring any acrimony into the debate. It is my duty to refrain from stating anything offensive, but it is also my duty to state facts, even if these facts may offend. It is my duty to state that week in and week out for months past all these positions have been advocated from one point of Ireland or another. If that is so, can there be peace if there is illegal intimidation? Eager as I am to see the restoration of social peace in Ireland, desirous as I am of seeing the end of illegal intimidation applied to the land question, and an end also to the perfectly legal litigation which is the curse of Ireland and inflicts a heavy burden on the population—eager as I am to see these things come about, I must decline to purchase peace by receding an inch from the position it is the duty of the Government to take up in protecting those who are exposed to intimidation and to prosecute all, even where it is necessary before exceptional tribunals, whatever may be their crime, who are guilty of intimidation, and who break not only the common law, but the statute law of this and every other civilised country. I pass from that. It is not intended to be a bellicose utterance, and I do not think it is a bellicose utterance, unless, indeed, hon. Members who desire to see the land question settled still believe, after twenty-three years of disillusion, that this weapon which is employed against their own countrymen leads up to settlement, or induces hon. Members of this House to look favourably upon attempts which one Chief Secretary or another may make to effect it. I must not in this way evade the indictment brought against the government of Ireland.

Sir, the hon. Member for Cork City attacked the application of this Act to large sections of Ireland, and he reverted once more to a statement, which is perfectly true, that in Ireland at the present moment there are not many crimes of violence against the person or of destruction of property. I have always said so. I said so during the first debate upon this subject in June, 1901. There are some crimes of that character which stand out, because, apart from agrarian crime, Ireland is so crimeless, and therefore agrarian crime, even upon a small scale, looms large in the eyes of the Irish people, and if there be but 20 or 30 incendiary fires in the course of the year, why, that acts as the steel tip to the spear of verbal intimidation, and it acts forcibly in a country where many men can remember the horrible time to which the hon. Member alluded, when there were, I think he said, 9,000 agrarian outrages in the course of three years. But I do not weigh upon that. I never weighed upon it. Before there were any proclamations—before the beginning of the last session—I stated that it was the duty of the Government to defend one set of Irishmen against organised intimidation at the hands of another set of Irishmen. We did that in the first place by mere police measures. We did it in the second place by proceeding under those sections of the Act which do not need a proclamation, and we were successful. Meetings with bands to march about and terrorise individuals have ceased altogether. They were used, I may inform the House, not only against those who may be supposed to be in favour of paying rent, but in one case, on the Morley estate, against two tenants who had failed to pay rents. There was a settlement on the estate on the condition that one year's rent should be paid by every one. Two tenants did not pay their rent, and the others turned out to intimidate them with a band and a procession, so deeply has the lesson sunk into the Irish people that that is the only proper way to persuade any one to do anything. The police stopped that procession, just as they would have stopped any other. Then we had on the De Freyne estate a recrudescence of intimidation indistinguishable, in my opinion, from the Plan of Campaign. The hon. Member has stated that we were responsible. I will refer him to the debate which we had on 24th July. But whoever was responsible, there was a great breach of social order—a commencement anew of an evil which only fifteen years ago wrought indescribable havoc over large areas of Ireland and reduced thousands of men to a ruin from which they have never yet recovered. It would have been impossible for the Government to overlook such a breach of social order as that, and we proclaimed in April those sections of Ireland where such crimes were prevalent—for they are crimes—acts which are declared to be illegal by competent authorities on law; and hon. Members cannot cite one judge, whereas I can cite all the great legal luminaries of the last thirty years, to prove the proposition that to coerce a man to take a course from which he could lawfully refrain is a crime, and a very serious crime. A third feature that has to be taken into account is the practice of boycotting. I have been criticised because the Irish Government did not at an earlier date proclaim certain parts of Ireland. When I was so criticised in June, 1901, the number of cases of boycotting in Ireland had fallen, and whereas it had stood at thirty-three in 1900, in June, 1901, it had fallen to twenty-five. With a decreasing number of cases it was right to refrain from a measure, the gravity of which I have never sought to minimise. But the numbers did not continue to fall, they began to rise, and when in April I asked the House to sanction our action in proclaiming a number of counties and our action was challenged the number stood at over fifty. Well, I am glad to say the numbers have begun to fall again, and now stand at forty-three. When the Irish Government are placed on their trial in this way, when they are accused of acting in a partisan manner, and using grave powers of the law without adequate cause, when we are charged with error of judgment in not relying on the ordinary law, I think I am entitled to ask the House to consider some of the things which have been happening in Ireland, and which did happen there for a long period of time before we determined to have recourse to exceptional tribunals. I wonder if the House grasps what such a thing as the Tallow case means? Tallow is a small town of 1,080 inhabitants, and in that town are two tradesmen—one called O'Keefe and the other Walsh.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: May I interrupt. We have often been prevented from making reference in this House to cases in which a trial is pending. Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that another trial of the Tallow case is pending?

MR. WYNDHAM: If that is the case I have no more to say on the subject, and I think the hon. Member is justified in intervening. It will shorten my present remarks, and when a third or fourth jury have disagreed I will return to the subject.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I submit that the right hon. Gentleman is prejudging the case.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The right hon. Gentleman may have spoken unconsciously, but he spoke of three or four juries disagreeing. I submit that that is prejudging the case by anticipating what the action of the jury may be; and I hope, Sir, you will see your way to ask the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw the observation.

*MR. SPEAKER: I see no occasion for my intervention.

MR. WYNDHAM: I gave way to the hon. Member and allowed his point, and I am not going to reopen the subject, though I think I might be amply justified in doing so. I take the case of the Thompsons at Templemore. What is urged against these gentlemen? I will ask the House to realise the condition of things there. Because some forty or fifty years ago there was a land quarrel there, between the holder of the estate and his neighbours, suddenly war is declared against a man and his family who have lived there in perfect peace for two generations. The case was brought before the Land League in the old bad days of 1879–81, and the League refused to take cognisance of it, but now an irresponsible stranger arrives and stirs up strife in the district, lights a blaze, I think the expression is, which is not to be extinguished in Tipperary until every man of English and Scottish descent is driven out of the county. [Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Nonsense. It is absurd.] I am glad to hear the hon. Member for Cork disclaim the doctrine preached by an agitator of the name of Corr, but it has been put forward again and again as part of the doctrine proclaimed by the organisation to which the hon. Member belongs. [HON. MEMBERS: No, no.] If challenged on that I am quite prepared to cite proofs here or elsewhere. [Interruption.]

*MR. SPEAKER: I would appeal to hon. Members to remember that they have received a courteous hearing, and, in the spirit of fair play, to allow the reply to be heard.

MR. WYNDHAM: Hon. Members from Ireland object to my making the only form of defence possible against the sweeping attack they make in general phrases on the administration in Ireland. What other form of defence is there when we are accused of attacking the liberty of speech and of the Press? Our case is that we interfered after months—after two years—of persistent and steady development, of encroachment on the liberty of individuals, which not only subjected them to pains and penalties from which they are entitled to be free, but ruined the whole country side in which they lived. [Interruption.] If hon. Members are so impatient that they will not allow me to tell the stories of these cases, I will take another opportunity of doing it. I only select them as they come to my mind at random from scores which could be adduced, and which all have the same characteristics. There is the Corofin case, an old quarrel which the National League of 1887 refused to take up. A man's brother-in-law had advanced him £400, or security to that extent, and becomes the owner in occupancy. Eighteen years afterwards a stranger to the district marches in and states that this is a contravention of the unwritten code, and this man, who lent £400 and spent £900 of his own money, is suddenly subjected to ostracism and every form of petty and even of grave annoyance, and that is done against the repeated protest of the Catholic priest in the place. There is no more pathetic figure in all this sorry story of Ireland than that of the priests, who, with exceptions that can be counted on one hand, have been for the past two years doing their best to hold back this movement. Hon. Members laughed. When an interruption is not relevant, ironical laughter may be supplied in its place, but I repeat that in almost every one of these cases the priest has joined the League very often in order to restrain it; he has tried again and again to restrain it, and finally found he was powerless to do so. In this very case Father O'Donovan stated in evidence that the man who brought his plea before the secret tribunal made the best case he could and had no case at all. Even Bishops have openly stated that, in their opinion, this social evil should come to an end. [AN HON. MEMBER: Name.] The Bishop of Elphin and the Bishop of Meath. That being the situation in June or July of last year, the Government found a new practice, namely the avoiding of a district which they had proclaimed by going just over the border of it and there delivering speeches to keep up those flames which had been lit around certain individuals, and which were devastating certain tracts of Ireland. Finally, when open intimidation by mobs and by meetings was abandoned, its place was taken by an almost uniform and sudden movement over Ireland by the local Press. Up to June, 1901, there was not to my knowledge a single boycotting resolution naming an individual published in any newspaper in Ireland. The first event of that kind took place in October 1901 and led the Government of that day to think that the time had come when it was necessary to make use of the force placed at the disposal of the Government in 1887. During the last week of July and during August these local papers consisted of little else except column after column of resolutions culled from secret meetings of the League, in almost every one of which names were given. In the *Longford Leader*, which has been referred to tonight, this practice was adopted, the threatening effect of which will be easily realised. Three weeks ahead it was stated that at the end of the three weeks all the names would be published of those who were members of the League and of those who had not joined. The pressure was kept up week by week by further threats against those who were not named, and finally the day came when their names were given in the black-list or the white-list as the case might be. Will any one who realises what the Templemore and the Corofin cases mean, not only to the victims, but to the country, say that the Government ought to stand aside because of a regard for the liberty of the Press—we should always have regard for the liberty of the Press—when that liberty was used as a vehicle of intimidation in substitution for those others which had been abandoned?

Then there was another feature. The war was transferred from the county and from the land question to the towns. There was what was known as the Roscrea case, which has been decided and to which I can therefore refer. A Mr. Menton evicted a caretaker from a house of his in the town of Roscrea. There was no quarrel about rent. The tenancy had been determined. The victim, himself, I believe, an advanced Nationalist, asked those who were working up the public feeling against him what was their intention, what was the reason of their extraordinary conduct. He said, "If you mean to wage this war against me in my own town, why have you not the pluck to do it yourselves?" and the answer was as stated on oath, "Why should we, when we have an organiser to do it for us?" Well, then take another case which has also been decided. Some sports were got up in the town of Birr by the Gaelic Association, which, I believe, is a Nationalist Association, though not the association which the hon. Member for Cork patronises. The hon. Member lives in the sublime belief that any one who does not join his association is not a Nationalist or an Irishman. The Gaelic Association believes in building up a nation by drawing all the component parts of the nation together. An organiser of the rival partisan association—the United Irish League—was sent down and a rival set of sports was arranged in which the amusement was to consist in a number of bands assembling and a number of men armed with hurleys. A breach of the peace would have taken place had not the Government sent down 160 policemen. And what followed? A resolution was passed at an impromptu meeting to the effect that the meeting desired to show their hearty approval of the principles of the United Irish League, and called upon all the business people of Birr to at once become members of the organisation, otherwise they would be compelled to regard them as supporters of Castle rule and landlordism, and refuse in future to patronise their shops. Hon. Members cheered. I am glad to hear those cheers, because earlier in my remarks, when I said that there was a section in Ireland who were in favour of boycotting shopkeepers who would not join a particular organisation those remarks were met with coldness and shudders of disapproval from the Benches opposite; and when I read out a resolution which is to that effect and no other, the sentiments are warmly applauded.

But, Sir, let us come closer to this matter. We were invited to send back hon. Members from Ireland with a message of peace or war, and I understood that a message of peace would mean a promise to deal with the land question. But even if the land question were dealt with to the satisfaction of every tenant, every landlord, and every agent in Ireland, it would be all to no purpose if, while it was being settled and after it had been settled, people were to be at liberty to convene a meeting with the object of declaring that every shopkeeper in a town who has nothing to do with land is to be boycotted because he will not join a particular organisation. Then, finally, a more recent feature which I deplore is that bodies which have been clothed with the powers of local government have passed one resolution after another to the effect that tenders are only to be accepted from members of this particular political association. I notice that some of them are not quite convinced that that is a proper course to pursue in discharge of their duties. [An Hon. Member: Coercion for Coercion.] One gentleman the other day said, "It looks rather bad to accept a contract of £2 a ton more than another." That not only looks bad, but it is almost the most deplorable thing that has happened in recent years in Ireland. The Local Government Act in Ireland is working well, I am glad to say, but nothing can bring it into greater discredit than that such courses should be pursued. It corrupts the whole civic life of the country, if persons who are in the position of trustees are to abuse that trust and place upon the ratepayers burdens heavier than need be placed on them in order to favour a set of persons holding particular political opinions at the expense of others. When we reflect that even when the land question is settled in Ireland, the rating question, and it is formidable enough, will be there, when we reflect that even now many Acts have been passed to deal with many parts of the country where the rateable value is low, and districts have been scheduled as congested, is it not idle that I, or any other Minister in my place belonging to any Government, should hope to persuade this House to deal boldly not only with the land question but with the rating question, when any critic can point to the fact that popularly elected local bodies think nothing of putting £200 or £300 a year on to the present rates of 7s. to 8s. in the £ in order to show their hostility to a particular section of the community?

I have only a few minutes more at my disposal, which I fear will not suffice to deal with the attack which has been made on the administration for which I am responsible—the attack that the magistrates are removable at the pleasure of the Government. There is not a case in which their decision has not been upheld by the County Court judges, who are not removable. Then all the charges against the resident magistrates disappear, and in their place charges are to be levelled against the County Court judges who are as secure as the judges of the Superior Courts in this country. It is idle to argue against critics who shift their ground with such agility. I do not believe that these men, distinguished Irishmen, are banded together to break their oath or to put an unnecessary slight upon their countrymen. If time availed I could quote passages from resident magistrates and County Court judges, showing that they felt bitterly the painful necessity of sentencing men who have sat with them as magistrates on the Bench to imprisonment. I believe them. I am sure that every man in this House regrets when a Member of Parliament has committed an offence which leads to his imprisonment; but every man in this House will agree on reflection that when a Member of Parliament breaks a law which exists for the protection of the liberties of all, and when that breach of the law leads to social tyranny and ruin, he must suffer, and ought to suffer, the same penalty as the men whom they have incited to act a subordinate part.

I must now draw my remarks, imperfect I admit, to a conclusion — imperfect not because my material is not strong, but because in replying to a sweeping indictment all that a man can do is to ask hon. Members to listen to typical cases, and then consider whether the action of the Government has been unjust, or arbitrary, or hasty. I maintain that it has been just, and that it has not been hasty; and I maintain that such action had to be taken if the existing land legislation in Ireland, or any legislation that may succeed it, is to be of the slightest avail. That we shall see legislation on the land question in Ireland hon. Members know.

I can now take up the challenge of the hon. Member for Cork with reference to the statement I communicated to the Press on the subject of land legislation. It was not a hasty generalisation. It was a concise summary of what I stated in greater detail in the month of January last. I then asked if any sane man would say that the Irish landlords and the tenants could afford to go on indefinitely with this fighting and litigation. I said:

> "The land question in Ireland must in the interest of Ireland be settled. By whom? It may seem a hard saying, but I believe it is true that no Government can settle a question of purchase and sale. Many have tried and failed. The question can only be settled by the parties concerned—by the party on the one hand who knows what he can afford to take, and by the party on the other hand who knows what he can afford to give. But is the Government to stand aside? By no means. The Government has many duties to perform, three of which are to use its best ability to bring the parties together, to assist the party ready to sell to turn the price which he gets to the best account, and to assist the would-be purchaser to give to the vendor a price he could accept without crippling his resources. In a word, our business as a Government is to bring Irish land into the market."

I still believe that to be true. To whom will fall the honour and glory of doing that, I do not set any estimation whatever. If I had a solution which I confidently thought would settle the land question, and if I thought that the hon. Member for Cork would be still more likely to settle it, I would drop my solution anonymously into his letter box. I believe sincerely that this question will be settled by many people combining together; and yet if it were settled at the price of abandoning the duty of protecting those who are exposed to intimidation and of making those who break the law in order to intimidate others amenable to the law, then such a solution of so great a question, inestimable as it would be in itself, would in that event be to Ireland, not a blessing, but a curse.

(11.45.) **SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN** (Stirling Burghs): It is greatly to be regretted that the right hon. Gentleman was obliged to compress his statement of the policy of the Government owing to lack of time. But I would point out that if he were inconvenienced and if the public interest has suffered —as I believe it has—it is because the Government did not choose to respond to the appeal of the Irish Members for a day—that the Irish Members have been driven into the irregular and altogether imperfect resort of having a short evening sitting. The right hon. Gentleman has now told us what the case of the Government is for the action they have recently taken in Ireland. I am sorry to say that I have listened on many occasions to a Minister either introducing some exceptional law or accounting for the application of some exceptional law which has already been in existence in Ireland, and there were two things on all such occasions that I can remember that were invariably done. In the first place, a case was made out of an unusual and extraordinary prevalence of crime, or a case was made out that the ordinary law had been attempted to be applied and had failed. Now, in both of those instances the right hon. Gentleman has had little or nothing to tell us. He admits, as everybody knows, that Ireland is almost crimeless. Well, I have taken the advice that the hon. Member for Cork has tendered to all who are interested in this subject, and I have looked into the statistics of crime, and one fact, at all events, I will quote to the House. It is with regard to indictable offences, which cover a large range. There were in Ulster 195 cases—[An hon. Member laughed]—oh, I jotted the figures down carelessly, and my gallant friend is perfectly justified in finding fault with me for not being more accurate. But, at all events, in Ulster, which is not proclaimed, which is not subject to exceptional law, there are 195 cases of this kind; in Munster there are 139 cases, and in Connaught 89. Surely that goes far to show that it is not in those parts of Ireland in which crime is most prevalent that this exceptional law is applied. I fully expected that the right hon. Gentleman would have based his case on boycotting, that boycotting had been carried on to such an insufferable extent in connection with land agitation that it was necessary to interfere. But the cases of boycotting, as the right hon. Gentleman himself tells us, have fallen to forty-three, an almost insignificant number, over the whole of Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: Forty-three cases—not persons.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Well, surely that would not justify intervention under exceptional law. But I turn to the second plea, which has always been urged by a Minister in taking these steps—that is to say, he has always shown that recourse had been made to the ordinary law and that it had been found insufficient. The right hon. Gentleman has made no such allegations here. He has said that there is a great deal of intimidation in different places, directed not apparently against any particular class, not against any particular section of opinion, because he quoted the case of ardent Nationalists who have been subjected to intimidation. No doubt every one here has as much horror and as much indignation as the right hon. Gentleman at any violent course of intimidation such as he described. But we want to know has an attempt been made to deal with it under the ordinary law before he has resorted to this extraordinary course? [AN HON. MEMBER: Yes]. The hon. Member seems to know. It has not been alleged at all events, and I believe, as a matter of fact, the ordinary law has not been resorted to. The right hon. Gentleman has quoted cases, and they do not excite any sympathy in me, but there is another thing which we must always bear in mind. When we find a disturbed state of society, with a tendency to take a violent course, it always arises from a deep-seated grievance under the surface which causes those who suffer from that grievance to resort to such methods. Now we all know that the thing which disturbs society in Ireland, agrarian society, is the question of land purchase, and how can we expect that Ireland can be peaceful and contented while the present state of things as to land purchase continues? You have advanced, as we have often said in this House, on an inclined plane, and you cannot expect your equilibrium to be maintained while you are going down the incline. You have introduced the idea, you have familiarised the Irish farmer with the idea, that he would have his farm cheaper as an owner than as a tenant. Unless by some method or other you can reduce all the tenants to the same position and give them the same advantages, you are bound to have always disturbances. As to these cases which have been tried before magistrates, who, whatever the right hon. Gentleman may say, are subject to the Executive of the day, the one essential thing in Ireland, as elsewhere, is to divorce the judiciary and the tribunals, high and low, from the Executive Government, and make them perfectly independent. But these resident magistrates are sent about on the instructions of the Executive Government. It was my good fortune to be a Member of the McHugh Committee which sat last summer, and that made us perfectly familiar with the Courts before which these men were brought. The next fact which strikes the eye is the severe sentences which are being given—sentences far more severe than any that have been given before in similar circumstances; sentences of hard labour; sentences of a degrading kind, and of an unnecessarily cruel and severe kind. And sentences of hard labour have this consequence—that any one undergoing them is, under an existing statute, disqualified for five years from serving on any public body. This is the punishment for a political offence—no offence of violence or outrage—by men who, on the authority of the Local Government Board, have admirably carried out the duties under the new local government system. I will not dwell on that. But what do we gain by the whole of these transactions? Can the right hon. Gentleman really hope to put an end to the state of disturbance and confusion by these hardships inflicted on individuals? No, Sir, the way to arrive at the removal of any disturbance of social order, such as the right hon. Gentleman has described, is to remove the causes which create that disturbance. The party opposite has been engaged for nearly sixteen years in carrying out the "twenty years of resolute government," which, we were told, was all that was necessary to make Ireland perfectly peaceable and contented. Now they come on with the adoption of these measures beyond the ordinary law more inexcusable than any the House of Commons has known before. The condition of Ireland is certainly not a very happy one when it has the Crimes Act apparently for its Magna Charta, and Sergeant Sheridan as the embodiment of law and order; and with the magistracy in some degree—in a fatal degree—subservient to the Executive. It is not we who deserve the name of Separatists. It is those who govern Ireland, and apparently can only govern Ireland, by methods like these—methods which are not to be found in any part of the Empire outside these islands. That name ought not to be applied to us, who have shown, and will continue to show, a more excellent way of dealing with the difficulty.

(11.57.) Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 121; Noes, 215. (Division List No. 426).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair

Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carew, James Laurence
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Doogan, P. C.

Edwards, Frank
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)

Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, J. M. F.

Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard. B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John

Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.

Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael

Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth

Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Cann, James
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Murphy, John

Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans

O'Brien, James, F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William

Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur

Redmond, William (Clare)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter

Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal

Taylor, Thedore Cooke
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tully, Jasper

Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersfi'd
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Ayes—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)

Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Beckett, Ernest William

Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, SirJohnCharles Ready
Compton, Lord Alywne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, SirHoratioD. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, SirEW(BurySEdm'nds
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hanbury, Rt Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, ArthurHoward (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
HowardJohn(Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. WilliamEdw. H.
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants., Fareh'm
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lockie, John
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, RtHnW.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, DavidJ(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, RtHn. AGraham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Pease, HerbertPike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (IsleofWight
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, JamesParker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. F. W. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, EdwardJas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, SirMarkJ. M'Taggart
Stroyan, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHn. J. G. (Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, RtHn. SirWilliam H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 28th October, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the Borough of Liverpool (East Toxteth Division.)

In the room of Augustus Frederick Warr, esquire (Chiltern Hundreds).—*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

WICK BURGH EXTENSION ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Considered; to be read the third time to-morrow.

PETITIONS.

BURGH POLICE AND PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Argyll, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Walsall; Bristol; Ravensthorpe; Codnor Park; Teignmouth; Coventry; Grangemouth; South Darenth; Dartford; Blaydon; Pelton Fell; Chester le Street; Clydebank; Sunderland; and, Clayton; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Cowlinge; Ipswich; Walsall; Woking, and Castlemorton; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Bristol; Walsall; Ravensthorpe; Codnor Park; Teignmouth; Summerstown; Dartford; Coventry; Clydebank; Pelton Fell; Chester le Street; Sunderland; Liverpool, and Clayton; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Widnes, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PLUMBERS' REGISTRATION BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Gloucester and Perth; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: from Bristol; Walsall; Ravensthorpe; Codnor Park; Dartford; Teignmouth; Blaydon; Pelton Fell; Chester le Street; Grangemouth; Coventry; Clydebank; South Darenth; Sunderland, and Clayton; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Eccles, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AFRICA (No. 4, 1902).

Copy presented, of Report by the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway Committee on the progress of the Works, 1901-2 (with two Maps and a Section) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Rules to be observed in planning and fitting up of public elementary schools [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Temperance Legislation for Scotland.

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce any temperance legislation for Scotland during the present session; and whether the Bill which the Secretary for Scotland has in preparation will be brought in this session.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) As the hon. Member is aware, the state of public business makes it quite impossible to introduce any new controversial measure in the course of the autumn session.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

India—Technical and Industrial Education.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state what steps have been taken by the Government of India within the last two years with a view to develop technical and industrial education.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) I have to refer the hon. Member to my reply to the Question asked by him on this subject on 24th July last, and to my reply to the Question of the hon. Member for Bethnal Green (N.E. Division) on 31st July last.† I have not yet received from the Government of India their matured conclusions on the subject of technical and industrial education, but I am aware that the subject is being very carefully considered by Lord Curzon's Government.

Motor Car Regulations.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will consider the propriety of requiring that every driver of a motor car in a public thoroughfare shall be in possession of a certificate of efficiency granted by some qualified local authority.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) As I have stated in reply to previous Questions, I am afraid there would be much difficulty in giving effect to the suggestion of my hon. friend. The whole subject, however, of amendment of the law as to motor cars is receiving my attention.

Siege of Ladysmith—The "Terrible" Gun Mountings.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will endeavour to provide for the Ladysmith gun carriages from H.M.S. "Terrible" being placed in some public museum if they are not otherwise disposed of.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) The gun-mountings which were in use on shore in South Africa were not returned to H.M.S. "Terrible," but were appropriated for military service, and it is understood they are still in South Africa. I shall be happy, however, to make further inquiries as to their present whereabouts.

Telegraph Service—Decrease of Candidates.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Postmaster General whether his attention has been called to the fact that there has been a decrease in the number of applicants for the male positions in the telegraph service, and that as a consequence the educational standard of the service has become lowered; and whether he intends to suggest any remedy with a view towards restoring the service to its efficiency previous to 1898.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) So far as I am aware there is no decrease in the number of successful male candidates for situations as sorting clerks and telegraphists throughout the country generally, but there is a decrease in London and at a few provincial towns in the Midland district. I do not regard this fact as more than a passing difficulty. But I am considering whether it is desirable to make any alteration in the system of recruiting the service.

Sorters and Telegraphists—Mixed Duties.

MR. SCHWANN: To ask the Postmaster General, whether he is now in a position to state the decision of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the working of the scheme whereby sorters and telegraphists are compelled to work in both branches of the service; and whether he can state if the chief telegraph superintendents throughout the country expressed the opinion that this scheme was the chief cause of the admitted inefficiency of the telegraph service.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The subject is still under consideration. No such opinion as is suggested in the latter part of the Question was expressed by the chief telegraph superintendents.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxi., 1144; cxii., 272.

Dingwall Barrack Accommodation.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether there is any probability of barracks being erected in the vicinity of Dingwall in the course of the ensuing year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The reply is in the negative.

Army—Defective Teeth.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he has received any report from the Royal Army Medical Department upon the number of men invalided in or from South Africa upon the ground of defective teeth, and if it is in contemplation to take any steps towards improving the dental condition of the rank and file.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The number of men invalided home from South Africa from the beginning of the war for defective teeth is 2,451. I have no information to show how many were invalided in South Africa. The subject of improving the dental condition of the rank and file in the Army is receiving careful consideration. Appointments of dentists were made during the war, and we are at present awaiting the results of the experimental measures which have been taken to remedy the conditions complained of.

South Africa—Army Rations Contract with M'Connachie Brothers.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state upon what date was the contract signed between the War Office and the firm of M'Connachie Brothers, Limited, for the supply of tinned rations for the troops in South Africa; whether it contained a fair wages clause; the number of tins contracted for; and the proportion of those rejected as being unfit for use.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) During the period of the war there have been twenty-three different contracts with M'Connachie Brothers for the meat and vegetable rations, all of which contained the usual clause as to payment of current rates of wages. None of these tinned rations was condemned, but a proportion of the emergency rations was found to deteriorate after they had been a considerable time on hand, and the firm supplied further consignments.

Lunatic Asylums Return.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will grant the Return relating to Lunatic Asylums, which appears on the Paper this day.†

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) I must refer the hon. Member to the reply given him by Sir Matthew Ridley on the 1st March, 1900.‡ As the Return is a costly one and contains little information beyond that given in annual reports, I do not see my way to alter the decision of my predecessor.

Conviction of a Metropolitan Policeman for Perjury.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether any other constable has retired or has been dismissed from the Metropolitan police force in connection with the case of the constable who was convicted and sentenced to five years penal servitude for perjury; whether he can state the cause of such retirement or dismissal; and whether any indemnity was promised to the said constable for his acts.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) One other constable was permitted to resign (this being equivalent to dismissal) for using unnecessary violence when assisting to convey to the police station the prosecutor in the case referred to, and for other reasons which, in the Commissioners' opinion, made him unfit to remain in the force. No indemnity was promised to him.

Alterations in the Prayer-Book.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that, in a recent edition of the Book of Common Prayer, the King's printers have made certain alterations from the authorised text, and will he state by whose authority they were made.

---

† "Address for Return of the Lunatic Asylums in the United Kingdom and Ireland (*sic*) on the 1st day of January 1902 (in continuation of and in the same form as Parliamentary Paper, No. 434, of Session 1895)."

‡ See (4) *Debates* lxxix., 1440.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) I understand that the points referred to in the Question of the hon. Member are the omission of the word "well," in the offertory sentence "for with such sacrifices God is well pleased," and the omission of a comma after "grace," in the sentence "outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us," in the Catechism. The following are the facts of the case. By the Act of Uniformity of 1662 it is provided that all ministers shall be bound to say and use the public and common prayer "in such order and form as is mentioned in the said book annexed and joined to the present Act." It appears that in the "annexed book," the sentence taken from the 13th Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews runs "for with such sacrifices God is pleased." The "annexed book," having been carefully collated in 1894 by the King's printers, in consultation with the printers of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the error in earlier editions of the Prayer Book was corrected. With regard to the omission of the comma after the word "grace," in the passage in the Catechism, it is to be observed that, though the comma appears in the "annexed book," the punctuation of that book is throughout of such a peculiar description that it would, if exactly reproduced in modern type, be inconvenient and confusing. As a matter of fact, the punctuation of different editions of printed Prayer Books has varied considerably, and in this particular case the printers at their consultation found that the practice was by no means uniform. In many editions, going back to early dates, the comma was omitted, in others it was printed. Having in view the great importance of uniformity in such a matter, the printers agreed that the comma should be omitted, so that the interpretation of the sentence should not be prejudiced in any direction, it being clear that the system of punctuation in the "annexed book" is not such as to justify the basing of an argument on the presence or absence of this comma.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

South Africa—Concentration Camps—Cost of Maintenance since the War.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state out of what fund the concentration camps have been maintained since the termination of the war.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The cost of the concentration camps has been met out of Army funds since the 31st of May, as before; a sum of £1,200,000 was provided for the maintenance of the camps in Army Votes 1902–3.

South African Settlement—Taxation of the New Colonies.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will afford an opportunity for the discussion of the general settlement in South Africa, and of the proposals of His Majesty's Government as regards the future financial arrangements and scheme of taxation of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies; and whether he will shortly be prepared to make a general statement on this subject.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In answer to my hon. friend, I have to say that I do not think the question is at present ripe for such a general discussion as he desires, nor do I think it possible that it will be ripe for some time to come.

Boer Generals at Cambridge.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Home Secretary a Question of which I have sent him private notice, viz., whether his attention has been called to a report in today's newspapers relative to the attitude taken by the mob at the meeting addressed by the three Boer commanders at Cambridge last evening, and what steps he proposes to take to prevent a repetition of such riotous and disorderly scenes at any future meeting of a similar character.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I only received notice of the hon. Member's Question a few minutes ago, and I have not had time to make any inquiries. I will do so.

Military Offenders in Civil Prisons.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the number of soldiers sentenced to punishment for military offences, now in local or convict prisons, and the number of soldiers now undergoing punishment in local or convict prisons, sentenced by the civil courts.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The numbers of soldiers in local and convict prisons are as follow:—Sentenced by courts-martial for military offences 235; sentenced by civil courts for criminal offences 192; sentenced by courts-martial for criminal offences 211.

Woolwich Arsenal Foremen's Pensions.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, W. R., Shipley): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can now see his way to state what arrangements have been made to safeguard the interests of the foremen in Woolwich Arsenal who at present belong to trade societies, and who will come under the new pension scheme, seeing that these foremen have in some instances accumulated as much as £140 benefit during a membership of forty years.

*MR. BRODRICK: The scale of pension offered is far more liberal than that given by the trade society to which the great majority of those concerned belong; the minimum which can be awarded under the scheme being equal to the superannuation benefit given by the society after forty years' membership. No foreman has been asked to accept the scheme if he did not find it to his own interest to do so. I must not be understood to confirm my hon. friend's figures.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Was not the noble Lord the Member for Woolwich informed, in reply to a Question—

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! It is irregular to thus refer to the answer to a previous Question.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: I will endeavour to put the Question in another way. Will the right hon. Gentleman consider on behalf of his Department whether it is not possible to avoid compelling these men to lose the benefits which they have accumulated for forty years?

*MR. BRODRICK: My hon. friend proposes that they shall have both pensions?

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Yes, they have paid for them both.

*MR. BRODRICK: Parliament would hardly be prepared to give benefits for which no sort of arrangement was made when they came in, if the men are at the same time to claim it from another quarter.

Somaliland Operations.

MR. HERBERT BOBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state what was the composition and numbers of the several corps under the command of Colonel Swayne in Somaliland and in other parts of East Africa, including transport and commissariat followers; whether any of the troops of the Indian Government were included in these forces; whether he will say what is the composition and armament of the troops ordered from India to reinforce Colonel Swayne; and whether an assurance will be given that all the charges incurred in the transport of these forces, together with current rates of pay, allowances for foreign service, and debits due to pension accounts arising from this expedition, will be borne by the British Treasury.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): On October 6th there were in Somaliland under the command of Colonel Swayne 300 men 2nd Battalion King's African Rifles, 500 men 6th Battalion King's African Rifles, sixty Sikhs from the Sikh contingent in British Central Africa, and also local levies 1,500 strong. Besides these troops there were two 7-pounders and six 9-pounder R.M.L. No troops of the Government of India were then in Somaliland. Since that date 270 men and four officers of the 1st Bombay Grenadiers, forming part of the Aden garrison, have already landed in Somaliland. The 2nd Bombay Grenadiers and 400 men of the 23rd Bombay Rifles, with six additional officers and two maxims and one half of a field hospital, left Bombay on the 23rd, and no doubt arrived at Aden this morning. The second half of the field hospital is under orders, and is due at Aden on the 30th instant. Besides these a further reinforcement is under orders consisting of 100 Soudanese of the 3rd Battalion King's African Rifles with two maxims, 100 men of the 5th Battalion, with one maxim, due at Berbera November 11th, and 300 men of the 2nd Battalion, and 390 men of the 1st Battalion, King's African Rifles with one maxim—due between the end of November and middle of December. The total force at our disposal will be 4,920 men. The transport and commissariat are arranged locally. The Indian troops are armed with the Lee-Metford rifle, the 1st, 2nd, and 6th Battalions of the King's African Rifles with the Martini-Enfield rifle, and the 3rd Battalion with the Martini-Henry. The expenses connected with these troops will be borne by the British Treasury.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): With reference to the orders to which the noble Lord has alluded, may I ask whether they are issued directly through the Foreign Office or through the intermediary of the Commander-in-Chief, and also whether, in the conduct of these operations, the Foreign Office proposes to or does consult the War Office.

LORD CRANBORNE: Yes, we do consult the War Office. All orders for troops under the Foreign Office, such as the King's African Rifles, are issued by the Foreign Office, and orders for the Indian troops are issued by the India Office.

Canadian Postage Rates.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether letters and newspapers can be posted from Quebec and Montreal to New Orleans and San Francisco at considerably lower rates than to Liverpool and London; and whether he will arrange that the postage between Canada and the United Kingdom shall not be higher than between Canada and the United States.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The facts are as stated in the first portion of the hon. Member's Question. This is owing to a special arrangement made between the Canadian and United States Administrations, over which I have no control, though its effects upon British interests are receiving my attention. The rates between this country and Canada are the lowest which prevail between the United Kingdom and any other portion of His Majesty's dominions.

Hong Kong Cable Rates.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that cable rates from Hong Kong to England via the Great Northern line are practically double those charged from Hong Kong to Russia; and whether he will remonstrate with the company, which enjoys a monopoly of landing rights on British territory, with the view of bringing about an abrogation of this discrimination between British and Russian merchants and bankers.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am aware of the difference in charge to which my hon. friend calls attention. It is in accordance with a well-established principle of the Telegraph Convention that adjoining counties like Russia and China or China and British India may make arrangements between themselves for lower rates than those which are generally applicable; and Hong Kong, as forming geographically part of China, has been brought within the terms of the special agreements regulating telegraphic rates between China and Russia on the one hand, and China and British India on the other. These and other charges have been under the consideration of the Colonial Office and Post Office, and I hope that it may be possible to reduce the rate between this country and Hong Kong. I ought to add that the Great Northern Company does not possess a monopoly of landing rights in any British territory.

Edward the Confessor's Chapel in Westminster Abbey.

MR. PAULTON (Durham, Bishop Auckland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the crucifix placed over the altar in Edward the Confessor's Chapel in Westminster Abbey during the preparations for the recent Coronation was put up with the knowledge and under the directions of the Office of Works, and, if so, from whom was it received; was it afterwards taken down by the Department and left at the disposal of the Dean and Chapter; if not, what was done with the crucifix, and by whose authority was it again erected in the Chapel, together with figures of the Virgin Mary and St. Joseph, for a festival on the 13th instant.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Hunts, Ramsey): The sculptured group representing the Crucifixion with St. Mary and St. John was neither put up by nor under the directions of the Office of Works. It was not taken down nor re-erected in its present position by the Department. Presumably this was done under the directions of the Dean and Chapter.

Continuation Classes in Scotland.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is yet in a position to say how much of the £9,000 which has been granted by Parliament this year for continuation classes in Scotland will be expended in the Highland crofting counties; and will he state the number of continuation classes in each of the six crofting counties.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): All the claims in respect of continuation classes in the counties referred to have not yet been received, and corrections may be necessary in the case of those now being dealt with. It is not therefore possible to give the exact amount of grant payable. Detailed information as to the number of continuation classes in each county will be found in Form A 48, which can be procured at the King's printers.

Steamship Subsidies for the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that a subsidy of £500 has again been granted by the Congested Districts Board (Ireland) to the Clyde Shipping Company for running a steamer from Cork to the south-western seaboard of Ireland, will the Congested Districts Board for Scotland consider the expediency of granting a similar subsidy with a view to facilitate the transit of fish from the Island of Lewis and the fishery districts on the western mainland north of Kyle of Lochalsh.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Board are not prepared to grant a subsidy for the purpose suggested; they do not consider that any information now in their possession would warrant such an outlay on their part.

Convict Muldowney.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a memorial from Mr. John M'Donald, of Dromod, and Mr. Michael Mahon, Dromod, praying for the release of Michael Muldowney, who was convicted for complicity in the Craughwell case with Patrick Finnegan (since released) at Sligo eighteen years ago; and will he state when he will be prepared to release this man.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The memorial has been received. The prerogative of mercy is vested in the Lord Lieutenant. I took occasion to bring this case under his notice, and have no reason to believe that there will be any considerable difference in the total period of imprisonment undergone by the two men referred to.

Extra Police at Boyle and Castlerea.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of

Ireland whether he can state the number of extra police employed during the last twelve months in the unions of Boyle and Castlerea respectively, and the cost of these extra policemen; where it is proposed to be charged; and when will the service of this extra force be dispensed with in these unions.

MR. WYNDHAM: No extra force has been stationed in the Boyle Union during the period mentioned. Eighteen men of the extra force are chargeable to the district in the neighbourhood of Frenchpark, in the Castlerea Unions in respect of the period to September last. This extra force has since been augmented by nineteen men. The charge for the eighteen men will be at the rate of £620 per annum. The nineteen additional men will entail a further cost at the rate of £654 per annum. The extra forces will be dispensed with when the services of the men are no longer required.

MR. TULLY: Has that period not now arisen?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not in a position to say that their services can be dispensed with as yet.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in the Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

(2.30.) MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W. R., Morley) said there was nothing in the Bill which transferred the right (enjoyed under trust deeds in some cases by the incumbent) to appoint the teacher to the managers. Ought not some such provision to be included in the Bill?

* THE CHAIRMAN: There is no Amendment on the Paper of that character.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said he would move to insert the words "by the managers" after "teachers." It was assumed by the Bill that the appointment was to be in the hands of the managers, but, as he had pointed out, there were cases in which the trust deeds gave the clergymen the power of appointment, and there was nothing in the Bill which would deprive him of it. The object of the Amendment was to make absolutely clear that the appointment of the teacher was in the hands of the managers.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 15, after the word 'teachers' insert the words 'by the managers.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) hoped the First Lord would see the necessity for this Amendment. At present the appointment of the teachers was given inferentially and not definitely to the managers set up by the Bill. The First Lord had said that the managers created by the Bill would have all the powers that belonged to existing managers, but under some existing trust deeds the parson alone might have the appointment of the teachers. This was the most material point in the whole Bill; they ought to have some explanation from the Government as to how the appointment of the teacher was to be made, and what bodies were to be consulted in regard to it. Was the education authority, in point of fact, to have any real voice in the appointment of teachers?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said the right hon. Gentleman had asked several questions of which he was perfectly convinced he knew the answers. There had never been any doubt or secrecy on the part of the Government, as to what their policy was on this matter. The appointment of the teachers would lie with the managers, and with the managers as a whole, acting in their corporate capacity, and, therefore, there could be no difference of opinion between the Government and the mover of the Amendment on that point. But whether it was necessary to make the Clause clearer he was extremely doubtful, and he was of opinion that it would not be improved if the Government accepted the Amendment.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT replied that general declarations of policy were not set out in the Bill. Where were the words in the Bill which declared that the appointment would lie with the managers? He ventured to assert that too much was left to assumption.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said that personally he did not much care whether the words of the Amendment were put in or not, but the matter was dark, and all the darker because there were now two sets of existing managers—managers under the School Boards, who had no right of appointment, and managers of denominational schools, who had that right. He would have thought that if ever there was a point on which a Bill should be explicit it was this.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said the effect of the Amendment would be absolutely fatal in a large number of cases to the object which his hon. friend had in view. There were many parishes in which the sole manager of the school was the incumbent of the parish, and the addition of the words proposed would involve a serious limitation. He hoped the Amendment would not be pressed.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he was not clear that the words carried out the intentions of his hon. friend, but at the same time it was very desirable that it should be made clear that the appointment was made by the whole body of managers and not by one man alone. There were certain trust deeds where the incumbent or the proprietor of the school had the sole power of appointing the teachers.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If there are trust deeds such as the hon. Member speaks of—and it is possible that there may be—then I think there is a case for inserting words to make the point clear.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said it was evidently the intention of the right hon. Gentleman that the whole body of managers should have a voice in all cases. As he was willing to introduce words to make it perfectly clear, he would suggest to his hon. friend to withdraw the Amendment.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWENS (Montgomeryshire) thought it would be well to lay down the principle that powers which were not to be exercised by the managers should be exercised by the local education authority. Would it not be better to say that the authority should have the whole control of the school except so far as concerned certain definite matters which were reserved to the managers?

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said that after the assurance of the Leader of the House that this point would be made perfectly clear he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough) moved an Amendment cancelling that part of the sub-Section which provides that consent shall not be withheld except on educational grounds. His object, he said, was to remove what he regarded as an undue limitation of the power of the education authority.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 15, to leave out from the word 'teachers,' to the end of line 16."—(*Mr. Levy.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'but that consent shall not be' stand part of the Clause."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR opposed the Amendment. The Committee had, by implication, if not directly, decided that the education authority should neither have the duty nor the right to mix itself up in denominational matters. He thought the sub-Section as it stood accurately expressed the intention of the Government.

MR. LEVY said it was possible to conceive grounds other than denominational grounds on which it might be desirable to withhold consent to an appointment. A teacher might go to school intoxicated. In so flagrant a case he did not suppose any difficulty would arise; but there might be other features of a man's conduct which made his appointment undesirable.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was of opinion that a case such as the hon. Member had referred to would come within the phrase "educational grounds." He could not conceive anything more detrimental to education than that a teacher should go to school intoxicated.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said this point raised the question as to whether secular instruction included everything which was not religion. He suggested that the authority should be empowered to object to an appointment on all grounds which were not of a religious character. It would be much better to put it in that form.

Sir JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington) inquired if the term "educational grounds" was not interpreted by sub-Section 2 of Clause 8, which gave power to the Board of Education to decide on disputes arising between the local education authority and the managers as to what was secular and what religious education. Would not "education grounds" mean secular instruction?

Mr. BRYCE said the right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that the division between religious and educational grounds was clear and exhausted. They could not agree with him, as there were many matters which might lie between. It would be a simple and logical proceeding to make one definite and make the other cover everything else. The adoption of words providing that everything which was not religious was a matter for the consent of the local authority would put an end to all doubt.

Sir HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) asked why the Committee should not exclude from the consideration of the local education authority all grounds connected with the giving of religious instruction in the schools.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) said the words "educational grounds" had already been introduced into Clause (*a*), and contended that it would be inconvenient to vary them in the present place. As to the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen that they should map out the whole field of what was religious and what was not, there might be questions which affected both the religious and the secular side. He took it that habitual drunkenness would affect a man's qualification to impart either secular or religious knowledge. The same might be said with regard to the case of a violent-tempered man.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid): Are the Government satisfied that the words carry out their intention? Would "educational grounds" cover moral instruction?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said the context clearly showed what the term meant.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said it seemed to him it would be necessary by-and-bye to have a very considerable extension of the definition Clause in order to provide the definitions of the many phrases which were used in the Bill as if they were precise technical terms, whereas they had no technical meaning at all.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said there was a good deal in the argument of the Attorney General, but still he considered the phrase "educational grounds" a very bad one indeed, and he feared it would land them into all kinds of difficulties. Suppose a master was appointed by the managers, and the education authority were asked for their consent. Would the latter body be able to do anything more than ask the man for his qualifications? He might have a first-class certificate, but on many other grounds be entirely unfitted, for that special locality, to be entrusted with the educational instruction. But if these words were put in he was not at all sure that the education authority would be able to go outside the teacher's efficiency, from the point of view of scholarship alone. He very much doubted whether, for example, in the words "educational grounds" they could put any meaning relating to moral grounds. He did not think they should adhere to this form of words, and in the case in which they were already appointed in the Bill they could be changed on the Report stage. They provided here that the authority was not to interfere if the grounds were connected with religious instruction in the school. Those were the words of the Government themselves, and he thought the proper course would be to put in the same sort of qualification with reference to the dismissal of teachers, and confine the rights and jurisdiction of the managers to matters pertaining directly to the religious instruction of the school. He thought the Committee would do well to apply these words to this part of the Bill as well.

(3.0) SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the suggestion of his hon. friend would have careful consideration when another stage of the Bill was reached. He suggested that doubts should not now be raised as to sub-Section (*a*.) He agreed that the points which had been raised deserved careful consideration.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) pointed out that sub-Section (*a*) applied to a totally different state of affairs. It seemed to him to be important that they should have the same words in regard to the appointment as they had with reference to the dismissal of the teachers.

MR JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) said he was not quite sure whether the Prime Minister and the Attorney General were present upstairs when the Clergy Discipline Bill was considered, but in that case they found it difficult to apply the same words to morals and misconduct. In the light of that Bill it would require the utmost care under this Bill, to bring within the purview of the local authority persons whose morals might not be all that could be desired. He hoped they would have some words introduced specifically pointing out what the grounds were upon which the local authority might withhold their consent.

MR. BRYCE said that he should support the Amendment of his hon. friend, on the ground that there ought to be an absolute right of appeal to the local authority. He did not think that that interfered with the power of the managers to deal with the religious instruction. The managers might make that a pretext for dismissal, but it would give security to a teacher to know that he had got a right of appeal, and that any action on the part of the local managers would have to go before another tribunal. It was right that such an appeal should exist. They must take it that the managers would be the judges of what was religious instruction, but even in those cases there ought to be an appeal to the local education authority, who ought to decide whether the teacher should to be dismissed. If his hon. friend divided the Committee he should support him.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he understood the Committee were quite content with the assurance the Government had given. They agreed that this paragraph should be brought into harmony with the earlier paragraph, and the Government were ready to consider whether the earlier words ought not to be amended somewhat in the direction suggested, though perhaps not exactly in that direction. This was, after all, a question of drafting. After the long discussions which had taken place previously upon this point, the right hon. Gentleman opposite now suggested that this question should be dragged in again. Suppose a teacher were dismissed from a Roman Catholic school?

MR. BRYCE said he was really arguing from the analogy of dismissal. They were rather dealing with the question of consent to an appointment. In all cases the managers ought to lay before the local education authority the grounds upon which they proposed to appoint the teachers. Although the teacher's fitness to give religious instruction was within their cognisance, nevertheless the whole matter ought to be submitted to the local education authority.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that object was not carried out by the words of the Amendment. The suggestion was that these words should be omitted. He thought the Committee understood that the local education authority was not to be mixed up with a question of this kind. How could they ask a Protestant authority to decide whether a person was qualified to teach Roman Catholic doctrine? The thing was preposterous. He could not think that that was what the right hon. Gentleman meant.

MR. BRYCE said they must assume that the education authority would have the common sense to see that, if the managers thought he was the best person to teach, they, the local authority, ought to recognise that fact.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that the right hon. Gentleman admitted that a local authority of common sense would accept the opinion of the denominational managers, and in that case this Amendment was unnecessary. There might be one authority that had not got common-sense, and in that case there might be a Protestant authority discussing whether a Roman Catholic teacher was qualified to teach Roman Catholic doctrine. Surely they would be stultifying themselves by such a proposal.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Prime Minister very astutely fastened his examples on to the Roman Catholics, but this Bill was more for schools nominally Anglican, but really Nonconformist as far as the children were concerned. Supposing there were three candidates, each of them communicants in the Anglican Church, and suppose one was better than the others as a lay reader, choirmaster, or organist. Suppose the man best qualified for secular instruction had neither of these extraneous qualifications, he would be put on one side and the other candidate would be selected because he was a better organist. Would the county authority be entitled to say the managers had not selected the best man, and could they withhold their consent to such an appointment on that account? If not, he did not see where "educational grounds" came in. The managers would say that those were religious grounds, but they were not if they were purely educational grounds. Would the case he had mentioned be regarded as religious or upon educational grounds?

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) asked would the educational authority be entitled to call for the testimonials showing fitness of applicants upon educational grounds.

(3.15.) Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said it seemed to him that there were two authorities, one to look after nothing but religion and the other after nothing but secular instruction. The Committee must see that in the definition inserted there must be something that would make the proposal work. The proposal was to have two parties to the carrying out of the appointment of a teacher. One was the appointing body and the other the consenting body. Would one consenting manager representing the local authority have the right to propose the appointment of a teacher, or would the Government confine the proposal to the appointment solely to those dogmatic four who were the guardians of the dogmatic teaching?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said they would all act together.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said he knew they were all sitting together, but they were people with totally different functions. He wanted to know what part the body whose consent was to be necessary were to take in the matter. Were they to have the right of proposing candidates before the appointment was made or not?

Sir JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said he was sure the right hon. Gentleman was capable of understanding the point if he gave his mind to it. The thing appeared to be perfectly workable. The six managers would meet and appoint the teacher. Any one of their number could make a suggestion to his colleagues. When they came to the conclusion to appoint Mr. A, that name would be sent to the clerk of the County Council on approbation, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the County Council would probably confirm the appointment of Mr. A, and there would be no further trouble. When Mr. A's name was submitted to the County Council as the local education authority by the managers in their corporate capacity, the County Council would take such steps as they thought proper to satisfy themselves as to his fitness for appointment as teacher. They could send for the testimonials if they liked before giving their consent, but they would probably only do so if they thought there was ground for supposing that there was some unfair conduct on the part of the managers. If they thought proper they could even see Mr. A before confirming the appointment. An hon. Gentleman had asked whether they would see the other candidates. No, that was not their business. [OPPOSITION cheers.] That cheer was really a very foolish one. They would not see the candidates, because the Committee decided yesterday, that the managers were to be the appointing body. Therefore, there was no use cheering. The local education authority was not to make the appointment, but to confirm it. The County Council being business men, and not anxious to misunderstand the Act, would take businesslike and sensible steps to ensure that the person appointed was a proper person to execute the function thrown upon him by the Bill. The whole proceeding was as simple, businesslike, and straightforward as it was possible to make it.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had made a perfectly conclusive speech. The state of things which he had indicated was precisely that which his hon. friend sought to bring about by the Amendment, namely, that the local authority should have the power of absolute veto of the appointment. It was said that the local authority was not to be hampered in any way whatever, but it was hampered by the words of the Bill as it now stood. What they had to do was to consent; consent implied choice; and choice ought to be accompanied by the means of judging of the candidates.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said they would not divide until they got this thing cleared up. The right hon. Gentleman called this a businesslike arrangement. It was a businesslike arrangement in which the one body paid and had all the responsibility of the business, and another body selected the staff. He would hardly call that a business-like arrangement. The right hon. Gentleman, with great ingenuity, had evaded the whole point. It was not a question of candidate A. Supposing that A, B, and C were candidates, that A was suitable, that B was better than A, and that C was better than either, and that the managers, for reasons connected with the Church, selected candidate A, had the County Council the right to go behind that and say "You have not selected the best man and therefore we withhold our consent to the appointment of A"?

MR. HERBERT LEWIS asked whether the local education authority was to have the power of testing the educational merits of more than one candidate in order that the best man belonging to the denomination should be headmaster of the school, from the educational point of view.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he should have thought this question an extremely simple one. The local education authority would deal with this state of facts. There were two candidates, one of whom was distinctly superior in regard to secular education, and the inferior one was selected for some extraneous reason—because he could play the organ, or for some of the other reasons referred to by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stirling Burghs. He did not, of course, for a moment mean to say that the man who was best merely as a secular teacher was always to be selected, because in choosing a man they must have some regard to his qualification to teach in a denominational school. They must have regard to the two elements. [OPPOSITION cheers.] He really did not know what right hon. and hon. Gentlemen meant. What the Government proposed was this. Suppose there were two candidates for a Roman Catholic school. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why a Roman Catholic school?] They should endeavour to realise the fact that there were Roman Catholics. Suppose they were dealing with a Roman Catholic school, and that there were two candidates for a teachership, one a Roman Catholic and a fairly good teacher, and the other a pronounced Agnostic.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: That is not the point I put.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon. It is the point.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I say it is not the point.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon. It is the point.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the hon. and learned Gentleman had not stated the point he put. If one of the candidates was an Agnostic that, of course, was a religious ground, and he took it that the local authority would have no right to deal with the matter. Suppose that in the case of a Roman Catholic school there were two candidates—both Catholics—and one was more helpful for the Sunday school or the organ than the other, who was the better man from the secular instruction point of view, and the man who was suitable for the organ was selected, would the county authority have power to refuse consent to the appointment of that man?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he should say that it was on educational grounds, the denominational qualifications being equal, if they selected the inferior man for some extraneous reason.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said the Attorney-General had not yet answered the question put to him. They wanted to know what power the local education authority would have in the way of withholding consent to an appointment made by the managers.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said that the Attorney General was entirely mistaken. He gladly admitted that if the Bill meant what the right hon. and learned Gentleman said it meant, the Committee had obtained a most valuable improvement. But the Bill did not contain what the Attorney-General said it meant. He put it to the Attorney-General whether the right hon. Gentleman would insert in the Bill a specific Clause which would give the local authority power to send for the names of the other candidates than that selected by the managers? Unless the right hon. Gentleman did that, the local authority would not be able to judge as to which was the best candidate. The Attorney-General said that if the candidate selected was "distinctly better" the election would fall on educational grounds, but if the selection was only "better" (not "distinctly better") the selection would not fall on educational grounds. He, and those on that side of the Committee, insisted on a clearer explanation. [Cries of "Divide" from the Ministerial Benches.] This was a Committee of the House of Commons in which they were discussing a Bill which not only affected hon. Members opposite, but the whole people of the country.

(3.33) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 193; Noes, 102. (Division List No. 427.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Col. Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Capt Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert

Greene,SirEW(B'ryS Edm'nds
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard,John(Kent,Fav'rsh'm
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys,Rt.Hon.Arthur Fred.
Jessel,CaptainHerbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon. Geo.T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop)
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Lambton,Hon.Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee,ArthurH(Hants,Fareham
Lockie, John
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Macartney,RtHn.W.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell,RtHnSirHE(Wigt'n
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More,Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray,Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pemberton, John S. G.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild,Hon.LionelWalter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,JamesParker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,Dr.E.C(Monagh'n,N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby,Lt.-Col.ACE (Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C.B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William(Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Brown, GeorgeM. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone,RtHn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey,Rt.Hon.Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt,Rt.Hon. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne,Rt.Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter,Rt.Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon.CharlesH.
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones,William (Carnarv'nshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorgeSmyth
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan,J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Rea, Russell
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Runciman, Walter
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merth'r
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas,JA(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips

Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas CourtenayT.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Williams,Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid
Woodhouse,Sir JT(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Levy and Mr. Alfred Hutton

*THE CHAIRMAN called upon Mr. A. J. Balfour to move the Amendment standing on the Paper in his name.

MR M'KENNA asked whether the Amendment which he had handed in at the Table should not come first.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The Member in charge of the Bill always takes precedence.

(3.45) MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that in moving his Amendment it would be quite unnecessary for him to add anything to what he had said yesterday. He had explained to the Committee the proposal of the Government, which he had every reason to hope was approved on both sides of the House; and he almost ventured to indulge in the expectation that without very lengthened debate it might be added to the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 16, at the end, to insert the words 'and the consent of the authority shall also be required to the dismissal of a teacher unless the dismissal be on grounds connected with the giving of religious instruction in the school.'"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said he wished to move an Amendment to the Amendment, the effect of which would be readily understood. He gathered from the Attorney-General that the words of his Amendment expressed the idea of the Government; and he ventured to think that they were much better than the words proposed by the Prime Minister. He made bold to say that because they were the right hon. Gentleman's own words. They had discussed the question of the appointment of teachers; and now they were considering the question of dismissal. They had provided that the appointment would not be complete until the consent of the local authority was given; and he maintained that the dismissal should not be complete until the consent of the local authority was also obtained. The Amendment of the Prime Minister would not make that consent necessary in every case, as it proposed that consent should not be withheld if the dismissal were on grounds connected with the giving of religious instruction in the school. In practice the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman would work as follows. For some reason or other a teacher incurred the disapproval of the managers, and was dismissed by them. No other condition was necessary up to that point. Then the teacher might go to the education authority and say he was dismissed on grounds other than grounds connected with the giving of religious instruction in the school, and ask that he should be reinstated. He thought that the Committee would agree that the right way to proceed was to require the consent of the local authority before the act of dismissal became a complete act. That was done with reference to the question of appointment, and it ought to be done also with regard to dismissal.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'teacher,' and insert the words 'but such consent shall not be withheld if the dismissal be on grounds connected with the giving of religious instruction in the school.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'unless the dismissal be on grounds' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that, to a certain extent, he agreed with the hon. and learned Gentleman; but he preferred the Amendment of his right hon. friend. According to the plan proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman, if the managers proposed to dismiss a teacher on grounds connected with religious teaching they would have to lay the matter before the local education authority and say, "You are bound to give your consent because the dismissal is based on grounds relating to religious teaching." That would involve considerable delay, and he thought it was a very reasonable proposal that if the managers believed that the retention of a particular teacher was incompatible with the religious character of the school, they should be at liberty to dismiss him. Of course, if the teacher showed that he was dismissed on grounds other than grounds connected with religious teaching, then the dismissal would be invalid without the consent of the local authority, and the post could not be filled up in the meantime, as the consent of the local authority would be required to the new appointment. The form of words proposed by the First Lord of the Treasury was convenient in itself and just to the interests of all concerned.

MR. BRYCE said he was very much surprised at the remarks which had just fallen from the Attorney-General, because they were absolutely inconsistent with the argument he addressed to the Committee on the last Amendment. Then he resisted a proposal to substitute words because he said that they would not be quite consistent with words in sub-Section (*a*). Now his hon. and learned friend proposed words which exactly followed words in the earlier part of the Clause and were parallel to them, and yet the Attorney-General refused to accept them.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the two cases were different. One dealt with the appointment where the consent of the local authority was necessary, the other with the dismissal where that consent was not necessary.

MR. BRYCE said that in both cases the words proposed by his hon. and learned friend would avoid a great deal of trouble and reference to the Education Department. Surely, it would work a great deal better in practice if the dismissal were not to take effect until the consent of the local authority had been obtained, rather than that it should take effect and be liable to be over-ruled afterwards by the local authority. In the latter case the teacher would be for a certain period under sentence of dismissal, although not actually dismissed. Surely, it would be more businesslike and more compatible with similar cases that the managers should send their statement at once to the local education authority, and have the matter decided once and for all. He greatly preferred the Amendment of his hon. and learned friend, and was very much surprised that the Government had not accepted it.

MR. YOXALL said that no doubt many hon. Members were in favour of some form of appeal by teachers against capricious or unjustifiable dismissal, but he supposed that in the last resort they felt that an appeal to the Board of Education did exist under sub-Section 2. As to the particular question before the Committee, he would point out that the local authority would be a court of appeal in every case of dismissal, except cases where the dismissal was on grounds connected with the giving of religious instruction in the schools. These cases would be of three kinds, and three kinds only—firstly, a change of faith on the part of the teacher, making it impossible for him to continue to give the denominational instruction required in a particular school; secondly, a failure, not by reason of a change of faith, to give in the school religious instruction in a proper way; and, thirdly, a course of life inconsistent with the giving of denominational instruction or any other form of instruction. In each of these cases he did not think that the teacher would wish to appear before the local education authority, as each would constitute an obvious justification for his leaving the school. He should regard with some apprehension, therefore, the reporting of every case beforehand to the local authority, which his hon. and learned friend's Amendment would require. He would much rather leave it to the local authority to decide any case where an appeal was lodged by the teacher or by a minority of the managers. He submitted that every practical purpose would be served by the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman, because it had been held that the legal notice to which a head teacher was entitled was three months, unless he had contracted himself out of that right by a special agreement. That would give a full opportunity for appealing before the dismissal was finally given effect to. For that and other reasons, or the full knowledge of the details of that special question, he trusted the Amendment of the First Lord of the Treasury would be accepted.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he was very sorry to hear the statement of his hon. friend who had just spoken. Only that morning he had received letters from teachers complaining of the insecurity of the tenure of their office. The point under discussion was that the matter should be decided before the teacher was dismissed. It was true that notice would have to be given, but he was not quite sure that it would be long enough to cover the period that might elapse before the meeting of the local authority. It would be better if the case of dismissal were decided by the local authority without putting the teacher or anyone else to the trouble and inconvenience of making a formal appeal. He did not see why the teacher should be dismissed before the matter was finally decided.

MR. FREDERICK WILSON (Norfolk, Mid) asked if the Amendment would include Sunday school work.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he did not think that that would be included.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said he had put a question to the Prime Minister as to certain denominational schools which had been leased to a School Board at a nominal rate, and the right hon. Gentleman had told him that those leases under Clauses 9 and 10 could be determined, and the schools turned back again into denominational schools. He wanted to know whether, if the leases were determined, the benefits of this Clause would apply to the teachers now employed in those schools, and whether, when the schools were turned into voluntary schools, the teachers would remain on, and only be dismissed on educational grounds.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said a voluntary school under this Bill would be the same as a voluntary school under the present Act, and the teachers in the voluntary schools would be in the same position when this Bill passed as they were under the present Act.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS agreed with his hon. friend near him that the teachers throughout the country would be generally in favour of this Amendment. He, however, desired to extend to the widest the powers of the local authority, and to limit, as far as possible, the exclusive functions of the managers. He still held the opinion that the dismissal ought to be subject to the consent of the local authority, limited as it was by the words of the Prime Minister, and, holding that opinion, he would be forced to go into the Division Lobby against the Amendment.

(4.3.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 200; Noes, 102. (Division List, No. 428.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornseys
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leed.
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch)
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A (Worc'r
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Denny, Colonel
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart

Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John (Kent Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Iver Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Middlemore John Throgmorton
Milvain, Thomas
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stroyan, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)

Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W (Norfolk, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Samuel Evans and Mr. Warner.

(4.18.) MR. HERBERT LEWIS thought the Amendment as it stood was extremely vague, and moved to substitute the words "directly related to" for the words "connected with." He desired to protect teachers from all kinds of pressure to perform extraneous duties for which they were not paid by the ratepayers. The words, "connected with the giving of religious instruction in the school," were capable of very elastic interpretation. In moving the Amendment of which he had given notice, he would ask the Attorney General whether the grounds of dismissal would have to be specified in writing. If that were done, the local authority would have an opportunity of inquiring into those grounds, and of ascertaining whether or not they were sufficient. He thought the Committee would agree that the words he proposed were fairer to the teacher and more conducive to the interests of education than those proposed by the First Lord of the Treasury.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out 'connected with,' in order to insert 'directly elated to.'"—(*Mr Herbert Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'connected with' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he could really see very little difference between the two forms of words. That proposed by the Government had given general satisfaction to the people most interested, and therefore it would be well to adhere to it. As to the Question put by the hon. Member, he took it that if any dispute arose the managers would in some form state what their grounds were.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked whether, in the event of this Amendment being debated, the Committee would be able to discuss the proposal of the hon. Member for North Camberwell with regard to extraneous duties?

MR. BRYCE agreed that the words proposed by the right hon. Gentleman were extremely vague. Would they include, for instance, attendance at early celebrations, or anything of that kind? The point, however, was not of first-rate importance, and he would not advise his hon. friend to press his Amendment to a division.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS, in view of the fact that the consideration of the larger question afterwards might be prejudiced by his proposal being now discussed, asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment to proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Orginal Question again proposed.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS asked whether the words "connected with religious instruction in the school" were meant to apply to the school only while it was an elementary school under the local education authority.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON asked whether the new Clause promised by the Government would extend to vesting in the managers, subject to the veto of the educational authority, the power of dismissal.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he had nothing to add to the promise of the First Lord of the Treasury. As to the other point, the words applied to the giving of religious instruction in the school during school hours, including the hour of religious instruction.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON, in view of the reply of the hon. and learned Member, said he would address his question directly to the First Lord of the Treasury.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My view, which I have over and over again stated, is that, in so far as functions are left to the managers of a school, they are left to be exercised by the managers as a body.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON pointed out that in some cases the trust deeds were to be departed from.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In that case the trust deeds would have to be modified.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said it had not yet been stated how far the trust deeds were to be modified. This particular matter was part of a larger question which, sooner or later, would have to be dealt with in a definite manner, so that the Committee might know what the position of the new managers was to be.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs) asked how the matter would stand if three of the managers desired the dismissal of a teacher and three did not.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: It all depends on whether the Chairman has a casting vote.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Who is to be the Chairman?

*THE CHAIRMAN: That question does not arise on this Amendment.

Question put and agreed to.

Words inserted.

(4.27.) MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said the Amendment he now desired to move touched the important question of Nonconformist teachers in schools. He fully recognised that there was some substantial basis for the complaint made by Nonconformists that they had not sufficient openings for their young teachers. The question arose as to how far, consistently with the principle of the Bill, that grievance could be removed. He was anxious to go as far as possible with justice to the denominational schools, and subject to preserving the principle of the Bill — the maintenance of the existence of denominational schools. His researches had led him to believe that the grievance arose in most cases from the fact, not that the schools were Church or denominational, but that they were under certain provisions of trust deeds which tied the hands of the managers, and compelled them, whether they liked it or not, to require all the teachers to be of one denomination. He knew of one or two cases in which teachers who had actually been appointed had had to be dismissed by the managers, to the great annoyance and, to some extent, the scandal of the neighbourhood, because they turned out to be Nonconformists. He had done his best to get the grievance redressed, but had been met by the fact—which there was no gainsaying—that the action was taken in obedience to the provisions of the trust deeds under which the managers were working, although the managers personally would have been glad to retain the teacher. It was upon the head teacher that the denominational character of the schools must depend. He did not think that they could put anything into the Bill that would force managers to appoint teachers of any particular denomination, but he thought they ought to free the hands of the managers as regarded those teachers who were not likely to give satisfactory religious instruction. On the whole, he thought his Amendment drew the best line that could be drawn. If it were adopted the managers of all denominational schools would be perfectly free to admit teachers of any denomination, and he had no doubt that, under the new system, if this freedom were given it would be freely exercised, and largely taken advantage of. He was well aware that his Amendment would not go the length which many hon. Members opposite desired. [OPPOSITION cries of "Hear, hear."] Unlike hon. Members on this side, hon. Members opposite were anxious to destroy the denominational character of the schools, but that principle in the Bill must be protected, and his Amendment did this while, at the same time, it gave the greatest freedom in the appointment of teachers.

Amendment proposed, after the last Amendment—

"To insert the words, 'provided that, notwithstanding anything in the trust deed of a school not provided by the local education authority, assistant teachers and pupil teachers may be appointed, if it is thought fit, without reference to religious creed or denomination.'"—(*Mr. Henry Hobhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said that after long discussion on small matters he was glad that they had now come to an Amendment which would have a great effect upon the religious beliefs of teachers and upon the admitted grievance of Nonconformists as regarded their admission to the teaching staffs of denominational schools. They desired on this particular matter to secure that religious and secular teaching should not be divorced, that time and money should be given to maintain the denominational character of the school, and at the same time throw the teachers' appointments open as widely as possible. This Amendment would go a long way to satisfy those requirements. It was an enabling Amendment, and put no compulsion upon the managers of the schools to choose from one or any denomination or from no denomination at all, but it did untie their hands where the trustees had tied them hitherto except in respect of the appointment of the head teacher. He wished to ask had any denomination any cause for anxiety in the admission of assistant teachers and pupil teachers of other denominations? He could not think there was any such cause of anxiety. It ought to lie near the conscience of every teacher that, as a matter of honour they should impress or impart no religious or political propositions, and take no advantage in influencing the religious or political beliefs of the children. He had not much fear of any proselytising tendency in any part of our system of elementary education. Then there was the power of dismissal on grounds connected with religious instruction. If a Nonconformist teacher was imported into a denominational school, and taught religious subjects with levity, or showed any desire to affect the religious beliefs of the children, the managers would have the power of dismissal, against which decision the local authority would have nothing to say. That being so, they could not help feeling that in the interests of the denominational schools it was important that the head teacher, who gave the character to the teaching of the school, should be a member of the denomination of which the school belonged, if the trust deed required it. If the trust deed required that the teachers should be members of any particular denomination, then the managers could appoint, under this Amendment, teachers from any denomination they liked. The Government did not think that any harm would come from such a relaxation as his hon. friend proposed by his Amendment, and therefore, on behalf of the Government, he was prepared to accept it.

Amendment amended—

"By leaving out the words 'notwithstanding anything in the trust deed of a school not provided by the local education authority.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words as amended, be there inserted."

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said he did not think the Government would expect the Members of the Opposition to fall upon their knees for such a concession as this. Anything more faint than the speech of the hon. Member who moved the Amendment he had never heard. They had now secured the headmaster, and that was all they ought to expect. They had a right to demand that all teachers should be under no disability at all. By this Amendment they simply enabled the managers to appoint assistant teachers and pupil teachers if they thought fit, without reference to religious creed or denomination. They were still perpetuating that disability in regard to Nonconformist teachers.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE: Why?

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS: Because they knew that these managers would still restrict the appointments to their own denomination. [Ministerial cries of "No, No!"] In the past these denominational schools had exhibited no desire when not fettered by trust deeds at all to extend the benefits of entering the teaching profession to any teachers unless they belonged to the particular denomination to which the school belonged. If his hon. friend went to a division he should support his Amendment, but so strongly did he feel that they were setting about this question in the wrong way, and only asking for an infinitesimal portion of what they had a right to claim, that he insisted upon moving an Amendment to the Amendment which would make it a perfectly sensible one.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, as amended—

"To leave out the word 'may,' and insert the word 'shall.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed "That the word 'may' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

(4.45.) Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that if his Amendment were carried it would be absolutely destructive of the denominational character of the schools. To appoint a Roman Catholic teacher in an Anglican school, or an Anglican teacher in a Roman Catholic school, or a teacher of no religion in a Jewish school, would be to destroy the denominational character of such schools. The contention of the hon. Gentleman was that the managers of a voluntary foundation school should take no account of the religion of the teacher they appointed.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS: "Religious creed or denomination" are the words of the Amendment.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the Amendment appeared to be absolutely inconsistent with the whole scheme of the Bill, and he was surprised that it should have been proposed. He hoped the hon. Member would not press it.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said the right hon. Gentleman did not understand the meaning of the hon. and learned Gentleman's Amendment. It did not refer to the head teacher. It applied only to assistants. The First Lord had said that it would destroy the denominational character of the schools, but the author of the Amendment to the Amendment said he was not going to destroy their denominational character. The hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment expressed the pious opinion that the managers would frequently appoint pupil teachers without a religious test. He did not know that the managers to be constituted by the Bill would allow Nonconformist gentlemen to be nominated to their schools, but even if they did, he did not think this would afford any satisfaction to Nonconformists when they knew that tests were to be applied to teachers and assistant teachers.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that was not the question now before the Committee. The pupil teacher question would come up later, under an Amendment down in the name of the Government, which excluded all religious tests in the case of pupil teachers. The proposal of his hon. friend the Member for East Somerset, which was accepted by the Government, was that there should be liberty of action given to the managers of the school to select all the teachers except the head teacher, irrespective of creed. Therefore let the Committee concentrate their attention upon that proposal. There were cases, he did not know how many, in which it would be perfectly easy for the managers of denominational schools to have among the subordinate teachers members of some other denomination who could carry on the general secular teaching of the school or take part in some of the undenominational teaching. But they could not lay it down that that was to be an invariable fact. They could not require of the managers, whatever the condition of the schools, that they should ignore the religious beliefs of the teachers. The whole of the religious teaching did not fall on the head teacher. It would be preposterous to require the managers of a Roman Catholic school—he mentioned them as representing the extreme and most easily understood case—to be indifferent to the religious beliefs of the teachers in the school. As his right hon. friend very truly affirmed yesterday, pupil teachers were learners, but with regard to teachers it was obviously vital that Parliament should not require managers to do anything so suicidal as to absolutely ignore the religious opinions, not of one or two, but of all the teachers in that school except the head teacher. He hoped the hon. Member would not press the Amendment.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said the hon. Member who moved the Amendment did it on the ground that in a large number of these schools managers would of their own motion choose Nonconformists. He said that the Church people were so broad-minded that if they got this opportunity they would in a large number of cases appoint assistant teachers who were Nonconformists. Hon. Members on this side of the House did not think they would, nor did the right hon. Gentleman. They thought it would be regarded by the majority of Church managers, who would have the whole thing in their hands, as destructive of the denominational character of the school. They did not think that Churchmen were not broad-minded because they were going to insist on their privileges. They had got those privileges, and they were going to keep them. That was the point of those who supported the Amendment to the Amendment. As long as the majority accorded to them in the management was maintained he believed, looking to the experience in nine out of ten of the voluntary schools in the past, that in the majority of the schools, whatever permission was given to choose from other creeds, the managers would insist on selecting Churchmen. But even supposing they were broad-minded enough to say, "We will not insist on any test at all," were they to be so grateful for this concession? Would men go into a profession in which the higher branches were restricted? They were going to tempt Nonconformists into these schools as assistant teachers, said the Member for East Somerset. How many Nonconformists were going in as pupil teachers when they knew that they were excluded from all the highest places in these schools? It was perfectly obvious that so far as Nonconformists were concerned they would still be practically excluded from the teaching profession. Therefore it was absurd to say that this was a considerable concession to the Nonconformists. It could not be anything of the kind so long as they closed all the higher branches of the profession to those who did not belong to the Church of England.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said he for one did not expect gratitude for any concession made to hon. Gentlemen opposite, who claimed specially to represent the grievances of Nonconformists. He said perfectly clearly that his Amendment only went a certain length. He believed there were many Nonconformists who would be very glad to enter the teaching profession, as assistants in the denominational schools, with the confidence of obtaining head teacherships in the undenominational schools, which would be open to them in the future quite as much as in the past, and which were by no means an insignificant number. He could not help believing that, after the sweeping changes which this Bill would make in the conditions under which the schools were administered, there would be a very large number of Nonconformists engaged as teachers. It was one of the first principles of the Bill to preserve the denominational character of the schools consistently with fairness and justice to the Nonconformists and all other classes of the community.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he intended to support his hon. friends on the other side of the House. He was himself a Nonconformist, and he regarded it as an insult that the profession should be open in its lower ranks to Nonconformists who were to be branded as persons who could rise "thus far and no farther." He was delighted that the Government had accepted the Amendment, and that they were going to put in the Bill in black and white a definite disability of Nonconformists. It was a step in the direction of freeing the Church from some of its bonds. They had reason to be grateful for the Amendment, for it absolutely proved the point for which they had been contending on this side of the House that there was no halting-place between the entire exclusion of Nonconformist teachers from voluntary schools and the freeing of the teaching profession altogether. If a Nonconformist suited their convenience they might appoint the candidate, but if he did not he was excluded. This Clause had all the intolerance of the rest of the Bill. He would vote for the Amendment to show the real meaning of the Bill.

(5.2.) **Lord HUGH CECIL** (Greenwich) said that if the Amendment were carried it would make it impossible to carry out an Amendment lower down on the Paper, which was to be proposed from the Ministerial side, the idea of which was that the assistant teacher should be a Nonconformist and the head teacher a Churchman. That idea was what they conceived to be the best solution of the religious difficulty, as all the pupils would be taught in the religious beliefs of their parents. He really thought that the hon. Member opposite and his friends had been very ungracious in the manner in which they had received the concessions which had been made from the Government side of the House. Since the House resumed the Bill had been very sensibly modified. The Government had pursued with relentless logic the course of handing over secular instruction to the education authority, and the Amendment completed their scheme, because it provided that, wherever possible, the assistant teacher was to be appointed without regard to religious belief.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he thought the latter part of the speech of the noble Lord was directed more against the Government than the Amendment. His idea was that the head teacher should teach the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church or the Anglican Church, and that the other teachers should teach the opposite doctrines. That was, that the local authority should run two rival theological shows under the same roof. If that were so, he did not think that it would be conducive to the efficiency of either the secular or religious instruction in the schools. The answer of hon. Gentlemen opposite to the contention of the hon. Member for Mid Glamorgan was that it would preclude the managers from appointing a Nonconformist teacher; but if his hon. friend's Amendment were accepted, the managers would be bound to take into account the secular and not the religious qualifications of the teacher. That was what they wanted. If out of half a dozen candidates there were two or three Nonconformists and two or three Churchmen, why should the Nonconformist be appointed if he was inferior? His position, and that of those who agreed with him, was that when they appointed teachers for the purpose of teaching children in State schools, in principle they ought to take into account the qualification of the teacher for imparting secular instruction, and no other. They were quite prepared to take a good Churchman rather than an inferior Nonconformist. Two-thirds of the schools in this country were denominational, and under the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment men were to be encouraged to go into a profession in which two-thirds of the prizes were to be closed to them He thought that, on the whole, every concession made by the Government had been treated fairly by the Opposition. The right hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that the position of the Opposition was different in regard to this Bill from his own or that of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich. The serious contention was in regard to the appointment of the managers and of the teachers. Everything else was minor. Whenever a concession was made by the Government the Opposition was bound to take it at its own value. They could not accept with gratitude a concession which did not alter the character of the Bill. Apart from the Roman Catholic denominational schools, and taking the Anglican schools, four-fifths of the teaching was undenominational in its character. All that was wanted was that there should be one man to give the remaining fifth denominationally, which the other teachers would not be able to give. Was not that a perfectly fair proposition? The head teacher would be perfectly able to give that instruction or to call in a clergyman or his curates to give it. All that the Opposition insisted upon was that in the selection of the teachers account should be taken of one thing only—his qualifications in regard to imparting secular instruction. He did not think the Government should demand more than that. The bulk of the money for the payment of the teachers came from public funds, and so far as the assistant teachers were concerned the Government should make this concession. The Prime Minister seemed to have overlooked the fact that the majority of the managers would be denominational, and practically selected because they were denominational. The whole scheme was drafted to secure a majority of denominational managers. What more did the Government desire? When they came to test this Bill as a real education measure it broke down.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the Amendment would absolutely exclude from the consideration of the managers, in selecting teachers, any regard to their religious or irreligious belief.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that the Amendment was perfectly clear that it would be open to the managers to appoint teachers of all religions or denominations, precisely in the same way as all civil servants were appointed.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that suppose in the case of a Church, a Roman Catholic, or a Wesleyan school, there was a candidate for the post of assistant teacher, and that that candidate was an avowed atheist. According to the Amendment the managers would not be able to take that into consideration. Did the right hon. Gentleman intend that?

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that certainly they could take it into consideration if they wanted to.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that then the hon. Gentleman had not considered the effect of his own Amendment. His right hon. friend had suggested that in proposing his Amendment he did not expect any gratitude from the other side; but certainly they did not expect that they should be exposed to such elaborate and studied misapprehension as had been exercised on the present occasion. They had been actually told that the managers in appointing some man in whose general religious principles they had confidence would be putting a stigma on Nonconformists. All he could say was that hon. Gentlemen opposite had exceeded themselves in misapprehension.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) did not think the hon. and learned Gentleman, or anybody coming from the country he did, really understood what the English system of education was. If he did he would realise what a small thing this present Amendment was. Because so long as the system in this country was what it was, the fact could not be got rid of by any words whatever. The system in England at the present time was that there were buildings under trustees, and the first object was to secure the religious teaching of a particular denomination. But with the ownership of buildings the managers or trustees had the duty and privilege not merely of seeing that the religious instruction was given to the people belonging to a particular denomination; they were responsible for the whole of the education of the people in the district. That was a great public service because, and especially in the rural districts, there was not always a choice of schools for the parents, but in this great public service it was found that the teaching profession in more than half of the schools was to be closed to members of other denominations. The Amendment of his hon. friend said that the teaching profession need not necessarily be closed as far as the assistant teachers were concerned. On whom did the decision depend? It depended on the will of the body of managers, four of whom were appointed to see that the religious instruction of a particular denomination was given. That was their duty. They had no escape from that decision under the terms of their appointment, and what the Committee had to remember was that it was not every body of managers that was likely to be tolerant, and that they might have to deal with an intolerant body of managers. The best way to get over the objections of the Prime Minister would be for the Government to say that they would leave this appointment permissive, making a dispensary power of over-riding the trustees to rest, not with the managers, but with the local education authority. As the Amendment stood he had no hesitation in voting for it.

*(5.20.) SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he desired in the first place to thank the Government for accepting

the Amendment of his hon. friend, which, there could be no doubt, would bring about a great change in the staff of the voluntary schools. In most cases under the trust the teachers were not only obliged to be members of the Church, but communicant members. He felt himself that the time had come in the history of education when the teaching profession, excepting the place of head teachers, with whose case the House was not at present concerned, should be thrown more widely open. How far did hon. Members opposite desire to go into this investigation into religious creeds or denomination? Did they contemplate opening the door of the voluntary schools to those who had entirely cast away all belief in the Christian religion, and had not only done so in their actions, but had made a public profession of having done so. Reference had been made to the fact that it was exceedingly important that the person elected should belong to the denomination of that particular school, because he would have had instruction in religious subjects. He was acquainted with a case which he thought might be of some interest to the House, where there were teachers belonging to different denominations, where a vacancy had occurred, and it became necessary to select a person to fill it. One of the masters who was engaged in teaching secular subjects was selected, and to his honour be it said, he refused the position and said that though he had taught in the school for many years, as the new duties involved the teaching of religious belief, he felt himself bound to state that he had years before given up all belief in Christianity. He appealed to the Committee not to impose upon the managers or trustees of the voluntary schools the duty of appointing to the post a teacher who was not only an infidel, but a man who boasted of his infidelity.

MR. BRYCE said that hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed in their arguments to ignore two large classes of schools. One class was the School Board schools which gave religious instruction. Why was it that they found no difficulty in getting competent men to give religious instruction? They were free to choose any one they liked, and the difficulties conjured up by the Attorney General were unreal. Education ought not to be hampered by all these regulations. The same thing happened in Scotland. There was no general exclusion of any person on the ground of denomination or creed there, yet they did not find atheists coming forward and securing the best appointments. He believed that there were not a few cases in which managers would be glad of the privilege to appoint some person who did not belong to the denomination. He congratulated the Government on at last seeing how illogical their position was. They were now standing on an inclined plane, and it would be impossible to stop in the present position of religious exclusion. They would have to go further. There was no question of gratitude one way or the other. That word ought not to be used in these discussions. The Opposition did not ask for any concession, because they stood on the ground of civic rights. Their view was that if the State paid for schools those schools ought to be open in every place, from the top to the bottom, to every member of the State. The Opposition asked for nothing less than their civic rights, and until they received them they would continue to press for the abolition of the restrictions that were perpetuated by this Bill.

SIR JOHN GORST said that he had often told the House that the religious difficulty existed only in the House of Commons and not in the schools. He reiterated that opinion now when he was in the position of an independent member, because he did not think that hon. Gentlemen believed him when he gave expression to the belief as an official of the Government. His notion of civic right was rather different from that of the right hon. Gentleman, who was a Scotchman, whereas he was an Englishman. But, rightly or wrongly, stupidly or wisely, the English people, as a people, had got a prejudice in favour of having religious instruction given to their children, and they did not consider their civic rights in education were adequately acknowledged by the State, unless the public instruction which the State provided was an instruction based upon religion. What was done in nearly all the schools under the present system was that the managers or teachers who ran the school contrived to give such religious instruction as was generally acceptable to the parents of the children in the school. For instance, in a Roman Catholic school there was little but Roman Catholic teaching. In most of these schools that they heard so much about, even the bigoted clergyman, who was continually denounced in that House endeavoured to give instruction which was neither unacceptable to the parents of the children — the parents generally cared very little about it—nor to the members of the religious body to which the parents were supposed to belong. He supposed that if they went into an ordinary school in a country district they would not hear a single word said which would offend the conscience or susceptibilities of Churchmen or Dissenters, and if the Government could prevail on the managers under this Bill to do that which the managers under the present system did of their own accord the religious difficulty would disappear. Where the civic authority came in was in the secondary schools where this was done. There the religious teaching was such as was acceptable to the parents, and there were many cases in which the boys of Nonconformist parents had gone to Church schools, with the express understanding that on Sunday they were at liberty to attend the chapel of their persuasion, and that they were not to receive any instruction that was not in accordance with the doctrines which their parents held. The Amendment before the Committee was a move in that direction, and, therefore, ought not only to be accepted, but heartily supported, by the Committee. It gave the managers powers which they did not now possess. Notwithstanding what had been said earlier in the debate, the clergy of the Church of England did admit Nonconformists constantly to their schools, and there were hundreds of schools in which there were Nonconformist teachers, even head teachers, he believed, but certainly Nonconformist assistant teachers. In such schools, what was more reasonable than that they should appoint a Nonconformist assistant teacher, and have such teaching as was acceptable to the parents of Nonconformist children, along with the Church of England teaching to the other children? As long ago as 1896 he remembered having a letter from a gentleman who was actually a Bishop, who said that he had been a vicar in Wiltshire, where he found that the greater part of the children in his Church school were Baptists, and that he found that the proper solution of the religious difficulty was to have ordinary Scripture teaching on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays, and on Fridays to draft the children into two classrooms, in one of which the Catechism was taught, and in the other the ordinary Scripture teaching. He was told that precisely the same thing held in Scotland. In the Island of Barra, where the population was half Roman Catholic and half Protestant the same thing was done, and no difficulty was experienced in giving both kinds of religious instruction in the same school. Catholic teaching was given to the Roman Catholics at one end of the room, and Protestant teaching to the Protestants at the other. It did not give rise to all these dreadful consequences. If the House of Commons would lay down the broad principle that the new education authority should make provision by which every child should receive such religious instruction as was acceptable to its parents, he believed the whole religious difficulty would be solved. Hon. Members opposite would, perhaps, lose their vocation, but in such a cause they would, no doubt, be willing to surrender it.

Sir John Gorst.

MR. M'KENNA said the right hon. Gentleman had made a most admirable speech in defence of a system of education which was not the system of this Bill. During July and August they had fought over and over again for the popular control of these schools and the government of the schools by the parents. That was voted against by the right hon. Gentleman among others, and now the right hon. Gentleman discovered that it was the real system. It was with some suspicion that he looked upon the acceptance of this Amendment by the Government. Not long ago the First Lord of the Treasury gave a pledge that the denominational control of the schools should not be left under the terms of the trust deed, but should be handed over to the whole of the managers. Did the right hon. Gentleman adhere to that pledge? If so, the Amendment was mere flummery.

Mr. ABEL THOMAS (Carmarthenshire, E.) said he should vote in favour of the Amendment because, as far as it went, it improved what was a very bad Bill, but he was surprised that hon. Gentlemen opposite expected the Committee to be grateful for the concessions made. After what had been taken away, these miserable little concessions were not worthy of consideration. He was also prepared to vote for the Amendment to the Amendment. He would like to know whether the assistant teacher was supposed to teach religion. If so, the four Church managers would not appoint a Nonconformist, they would not "see fit" to do so. But if the assistant teacher was not to teach religion, what difference could his religion, or want of religion, possibly make? An atheist could teach mathematics quite as well as the most religious Churchman in the world. He should support not only the Amendment, but the Amendment to the Amendment.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR appealed to the Committee to come to a decision on the Amendment.

Mr. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) said a very important consideration was involved in the Amendment. There would be appointed a large number of teachers whose whole time would not be occupied by one particular school, but who would be teaching in different schools on different days of the week. There were several kinds of teaching, such as that of drawing or wood-carving, which would have to be supplied by the educational authority by means of these itinerant teachers. Surely in such cases it was not necessary to know the religious belief of the teachers. The educational authority ought not to be so handicapped. The Amendment as amended in the manner proposed would constitute a valuable addition to the Bill.

(5.51.) Question proposed.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 246; Noes, 125. (Division List, No. 429.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.

Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt Hon William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macartney, Rt. Hn W G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lieut-Col Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffi'ld
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hon Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald

Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hn. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, George (York, W. R.)
Whiteley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Samuel Evans and Mr. Trevelyan.

Words, as amended, inserted.

(6.5.) DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) moved an Amendment adding words which would also provide that it should not be lawful for any body of managers to make it a condition of appointment that a teacher should undertake to perform or abstain from performing any duties outside the ordinary school hours or unconnected with the ordinary work of the school. He at once admitted that the purpose he had in view had been sensibly modified by the Amendment, which the Government had accepted, giving a veto to the local authority on the dismissal of a teacher under certain circumstances, but to what extent he could not yet say. What he was trying to deal with was the case in which it was made a condition precedent to the appointment of a teacher, that in order to obtain the appointment he should undertake to perform certain extraneous duties. He agreed at once that the school teacher should be always ready to co-operate generously with the managers out of school in anything which affected the well-being of the children and the community in which they lived, and he thought teachers were prepared to co-operate in all these things, and they did undertake considerable duties outside their ordinary work. What he said was, that when the teachers had done good service to the State in the school they should be permitted to do exactly what they pleased in their own private leisure, which was not outside the limits of the propriety demanded from a school teacher. Under this new era what he insisted upon was, that when the managers appointed a teacher they should appoint a teacher and not a parochial factotum. When appointments of this kind had been made in the past other matters had been brought into consideration, and it very often happened that the best man had not been appointed, and the man appointed was generally a person who had undertaken to perform all sorts of extraneous duties. He did not blame the Church parsons in this matter. He had in his hand a brief extract from the first circular which was sent down to the principal training colleges signed by "J. Kay-Shuttleworth & E. G. Tuffnall." They sent a memorandum to the training college principals advising them as to the lines along which the training of the teachers should go. It was advice to the principals of the training colleges of an official character as to what the State's ideal was in the matter of training teachers. This memorandum says:—

> "In the formation of the character of the schoolmaster, the discipline of the training college should be so devised as to prepare him for the modest respectability of his lot. Without the spirit of self-denial, he is nothing. His reward must be in his work. There should be great simplicity in the life of such a man. Obscure and secluded schools need masters of a contented spirit, to whom the training of the children committed to their charge has charms sufficient to concentrate their thoughts and exertions on the humble sphere in which they live, notwithstanding the privations of a life but little superior to the level of the surrounding peasantry. When the scene of the teacher's exertions is in the neighbourhood which brings him into association with the middle and upper classes of society, his emoluments will be greater, and he will be surrounded by temptations which, in the absence of a suitable preparation of mind, might rob him of that

humility and gentleness which are among the most necessary qualifications of the teacher of a common school."

Now came the point to which he desired to call special attention. The statement went on—

> "He should be accustomed to the performance of those parochial duties in which the schoolmaster may lighten the burden of the clergyman. For this purpose he should learn to keep the accounts of the benefit club. He should instruct and manage the village choir, and should learn to play the organ."

That being the State's ideal 60 years ago, he did not complain that the village parson felt justified in calling into requisition these teachers. But a great deal of water had gone under London Bridge since that time, and whilst he thought the teacher should assist in every way yet he should be permitted in his leisure time to do what he pleased, always provided that he did nothing outside the limits which propriety expected of him, and provided that he did nothing which would exhaust the energies required for the performance of his ordinary duties he had no objection to the teacher playing the village organ. If he were a village teacher he thought that he should apply for the post because it would be a very agreeable change. He should, however, have to learn to play the instrument first. He had no objection to the teacher using his services in any way he pleased providing he did not exhaust himself, and providing it did not militate against the teacher performing his proper work. Cases had come under his notice where a small School Board had said to a teacher seeking an appointment: "The last teacher played the church organ, and if you are going to get this appointment you must do so." He had no objection to a teacher playing the organ if he liked to do so, but he objected to it if it was made a condition of his obtaining and retaining his situation. He admitted that in recent years there had been a very great improvement in the matter of this particular question. He could very well remember that within the last fifteen years more than half of the advertisements for teachers for voluntary schools began with three words, "School, organ, choir," but still it was much too often a condition precedent that if a teacher wished to get an appointment he had to take other duties to those of the school. The hon. Member produced a copy of the *School Guardian*, the organ of the National Society, for 21st June, 1900, in which there were six advertisements for head teachers, and in four cases the requirements included qualifications which were extraneous to those of school teacher, the qualifications being made a condition precedent to appointment. No doubt payments were made in many cases for these extra services, but that was not the point. The condition narrowed the circle of selection. They were now giving the local authority power over secular instruction, and anything which militated against the teacher's proper discharge of his duties as secular instructor was a matter over which the authority should have a veto. His point simply was, if the teacher wished to do these things—playing the organ, superintending the Sunday school, and singing in the choir—by all means let him do so, but he should not be compelled to do them, and he should be able to give them up if he thought fit. Some time ago he sent out a circular to the teachers in certain counties on this subject, and in their replies, some of which the hon. Member read to the Committee, they made it clear that the extra duties, with some of them, were made a condition precedent to their engagement, and that they could not give them up without prejudice to their office. These things might have been tolerable in the past, but they were not so now, when the money came out of the public funds. This problem would be vastly improved under this Bill, because candidates for teacherships would have six managers to deal with instead of one. He had no doubt that where in the past it had been possible to make appointments with such conditions attached, it would not be so possible in the future. If a teacher refused to perform these duties he might be dismissed by the managers, but the local authority on appeal by the teacher could veto the dismissal. He hoped he rightly interpreted the effect of the appeal to the local authority. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed, after the last Amendment—

> "To insert the words, 'Provided also that it shall not be lawful for any body of managers to make it a condition of appointment in the case of any teacher, that the said teacher shall undertake to perform or to abstain from performing any duties outside the ordinary school hours or unconnected with the ordinary work of the school.'"—(*Dr Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

(6.30.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that although he was not disposed to recommend the Committee to adopt this Amendment, he had nothing to complain of either in the tone of the statement made by the hon. Gentleman or in the matter of it. He had gone very completely into the question in a spirit of great moderation. He gathered that the hon. Member agreed that it would be a great pity if the Committee were to suggest or, still more, to lay down in exact terms that a schoolmaster should do nothing except teach the children secular instruction in the school. It would be a great injury to the schoolmaster, because in many cases the schoolmaster could earn an addition to his salary, and it would be a great injury to the parish, because in many out-of-the-way parishes there was practically nobody who could aid a certain side of parochial life except the parson and other religious ministers in the parish and the schoolmaster. It would be as profound a pity to limit the activity of the schoolmaster to his scholastic duties as it would be to limit the duties of the clergy strictly to their clerical work. On these points he thought the Committee on both sides of the House would probably be in agreement with the hon. Gentleman and himself. Then the question arose—Was there likely, under the Bill as it now stood, to be such an abuse of this practice as to make it now desirable to add the rather elaborate provision which the hon. gentleman proposed by his Amendment? He thought not. From the hon. Gentleman's own statement it must be evident that the protection already given to the schoolmaster was of so elaborate a kind that any further elaboration was hardly necessary. To begin with, his salary would be paid for teaching in the school, and for that alone. It could not include in the future, as it had in the past, payment for anything outside the work in the school during school hours. The education authority would be acting illegally, and would be liable to surcharge, if they permitted any of the money they gave to the schoolmaster to be payment for work in the Sunday school, or in connection with the choir or the service of the church. Therefore, if the schoolmaster had to do anything outside his strict scholastic duties, he must do it because he liked it, or because it was worth his while. There was another great protection. He admitted that there were cases, he hoped not many, in which teachers, already overburdened by their strictly scholastic duties, were obliged, in order to keep their places, to do other work during the few hours of rest which Saturday afternoon or Sunday might give them, but by the Bill that was absolutely stopped. There could be no doubt that by thus overburdening the teachers, their efficiency as teachers of secular education would be interfered with, and therefore the education authority would have, not only the right, but the duty, to intervene. In the third place, it was quite clear that if any contract was entered into between a teacher and the managers before the teacher was nominated and appointed, the whole sanction for that contract was removed by the Bill. If the teacher was threatened with dismissal for refusing to fulfil such a contract, he could appeal to the education authority. That appeal would be heard by the education authority, and they could enforce their view of the matter. He hoped that he had made the position so clear to the Committee that they would see that they would be doing no good to the teachers or to the managers by cumbering the Bill with this condition, which he thought was perfectly unnecessary, either in educational or the personal interests of the teachers.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said that the Amendment could do no harm, and might do good, as it only asked that the managers should not make it a condition of the appointment of a teacher that he should do parochial work. As the Bill stood, the managers might appoint a schoolmaster, and promise to give him a salary of £150 a year provided he did extraneous work. He earnestly asked the Government to accept the Amendment, which only carried out the ideas of the Prime Minister himself.

MR. YOXALL said he thought the First Lord of the Treasury was mistaken in supposing that the payment of the salary by the education authority would prevent the performance of extraneous tasks being made a condition precedent to the appointment of a teacher. The thing would work out in this way. The vicar, or the churchwardens, or the denominational managers would convey to a given candidate that if he would consent to undertake certain parochial duties on Sunday, he would be placed in the way of obtaining, after his nomination and appointment, from the education authority a salary for performing the secular work of the school. In that way they might induce him to do Sunday School work, play the organ, superintend the clothing club, and for these offices he might receive £5 or £10 per year. This was not such a new thing as the First Lord of the Treasury supposed; and he was afraid that the alteration proposed to be made in the Bill would not remove the ground of complaint which existed in many cases. He recognised the difficulty in laying down a hard and fast line, but he suggested to the First Lord of the Treasury that the right hon. Gentleman should take time to consider this matter, and whether another course might not be possible. In justice to the teachers and to the efficiency of the schools, he hoped that the First Lord would not absolutely refuse to accept this Amendment altogether.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said that this matter had been exclusively discussed hitherto from the point of view of the teachers, and he asked the Committee to consider it from the point of view of the local authority. It appeared to him that the Amendment would be a great advantage and protection to the local authority as well as to the teachers. Unless he entirely misinterpreted the Bill, the local authority would be in a very difficult position when fixing the salaries of the teachers. They would not know what the exact position of the teachers was to be, and whether they were, or were not, expected to perform other duties than those connected with the school. It had been pointed out that under the Code an attempt had been made to make it clear that the salaries of the teachers were not to be paid except for duties in connection with the school, but that it had been exceedingly difficult to keep to that rule. In certain parishes the teacher were expected to play the organ, and even to perform the duties of the sexton. If the Government did not insert this power tonight, he hoped they would take another opportunity of doing so. He asked the First Lord of the Treasury to complete the admirable work he had commenced, and make a clean job of the matter.

(6.47.) SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that every member of the Committee would be in entire sympathy with the hon. Member who moved the Amendment. But it would be clearly *ultra vires* for the managers to impose an extraneous duty on a teacher as a condition of employment. They could no more impose a condition of that kind than they could impose conditions as to the salary. There were six managers, of whom the majority were laymen, and two were appointed by the local authority; and there was the veto of the local authority on the appointment and dismissal of teachers, which he had no doubt would be at once exercised if a man was dismissed for not performing duties he was not selected to perform; so that the protection was ample. It was not, in his opinion, wise to multiply minute provisions of this kind. Even if it were found that the six managers were guilty of attempting to do that which the Section would not allow, the hon. Member could trust the veto of the local education authority. He hoped the hon. Member would not consider it necessary to press this Amendment.

MR. ASQUITH (Fife, E.) expressed surprise at the interpretation which the hon. and learned Gentleman had placed upon the Clause, which amounted to this, that, in the opinion of the Attorney General, under the Clause as it stood it would be *ultra vires* for the managers to make the performance of any non-scholastic duty a condition of the teacher's appointment.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that that was not what he said. What he said was that it would be *ultra vires* for the managers to impose other duties which were to be covered by the salary paid by the local authority, which was rather a different proposition.

MR. ASQUITH said that that distinction showed the necessity for the Amendment. It was clear that the question of the protection which the Prime Minister agreed the teachers ought to have was not traversed by the Amendment of his hon. friend. It was not given by the Clause. He agreed that the debate had been conducted in a fair and temperate spirit on both sides of the House, and he agreed that the protection was increased, but in this matter it must be remembered that there was a long, inveterate, and traditional practice to be overcome. In a large number of denominational schools the teachers had always been appointed on condition that in their spare hours they should perform parochial duties. They could not change that position. The pressure brought to bear on managers by persons interested in the Church to keep to the old system would be so strong that unless there were the prohibition of an Act of Parliament the system would be continued. Nobody objected to the schoolmasters utilising their spare hours in these matters, but on the other hand the State had the right to demand their best labour and best ability. This was a very important matter. It was not sufficiently covered in the Clause as it stood. The Prime Minister agreed that the principle of the Amendment ought to be adopted, and the House was also practically unanimous upon the matter. That being so, why should not they put the effect of what they agreed upon on the Statute Book?

*MR. DUKE (Plymouth) said he was glad that the objection to this Amendment on the part of the Government was not one of principle. The objection to its acceptance was the overloading of the Bill with matters of detail. That was an objection that every one took in common with the Prime Minister, but he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see his way at a later stage to reconsider this matter and accept the principle which underlay the Amendment. No doubt it would be a breach of trust to apply as remuneration for extraneous duties a part of the money given for payment of salaries, and no such breach of trust was probable, but there was a further question to be considered. The question was whether willingness and ability to perform extraneous duties were to be considerations in the appointment of teachers. If that was maintained the matter was far more serious, because the first thing the managers would do would be to inform themselves as to whether the schoolmaster was one who would bind himself to perform these duties. The candidate who was willing and able would be welcome, while the candidate who was not, though educationally more efficient, would be unwelcome. He did not wish to labour the point; all he desired to add was the observation that this was a Bill that was not regarded without jealousy, not only among the political supporters of hon. Gentlemen opposite, but also the political supporters of members on the Government side of the House. There were those who heartily supported the Bill but felt that it was a new departure in education which needed to be watched and safeguarded. He trusted the Leader of the House would have regard to that jealousy, because jealousy was a factor which would affect the working of the Bill, and that in this matter, which did not involve a question of principle, and where, in the words of the Attorney General, the interests of the teachers were to be safeguarded, the right hon. Gentleman would see if it were not possible to meet the demand of the hon. Member for North Camberwell at any rate by drafting a form of contract for teachers which would make clear the actual conditions of their appointment.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) hoped after the general expression of opinion in favour of the Amendment, the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to accept it. He thought it would be found that throughout the country the schoolmasters were only too glad to assist in Church matters, but in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the great grievance was that there was no additional payment for the services. He could see no reason why the Amendment could not be accepted.

(6.58.) MR. JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham) asked the First Lord of the Treasury if he could not see his way to give the substance of the Amendment. He fully agreed with what had been said about overloading the Bill, and it appeared to him that the Committee had been engaged too long in trying to paint the lily and gild refined gold. Personally he did not think the Amendment was necessary; he thought all that was necessary could be done under the Bill as it stood; but the teachers would value the substance of these words very much, and it would also convey to them the message that the House of Commons appreciated their difficulty.

SIR W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford) expressed the opinion that the Committee were devoting a great deal of time to a matter not worth discussion. All were agreed as to what was to be secured, and that was, once and for all for Parliament to put its foot down upon a very evil system. He was very much opposed to burdening the Clause with these words, but he hoped the First Lord of the Treasury would go further than he had done in his speech, and would give them an assurance that words should be introduced, either in some future clause of the Bill or in the Code itself, specifically declaring that this evil system was illegal.

SIR JOHN GORST said this matter could be perfectly well dealt with in the Education Code. At the present moment it was required under the Code that the engagement of every teacher should be made in writing. There was a form specially prepared, and there was nothing in the form of that engagement which gave any encouragement whatever to extraneous tasks.

DR. MACNAMARA: It does not exclude them.

SIR JOHN GORST said that was so, but it discouraged them in so far that the model form of agreement did not exclude extraneous tasks. It was very easy to go a little further, and there was no difficulty whatever in the Government now making a promise to consider the propriety of providing that the engagement between the teacher and his employers should be made according to a specific form, and that that form should specifically exclude any extraneous tasks, and that the Board of Education would not recognise any teacher who was engaged in any other form than that laid down in the Code.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN said it appeared to him that for the purpose of aiding those who had to administer this Act it would be much better if this were embodied in the Clause; it would not have the same weight if embodied in the Code. There was another point, also; if it were embodied in the Code, when the Code came before the House, if the form of agreement were not satisfactory the Government might not be in so friendly a mood as at present. Therefore he hoped the Government would give way on this trifling point, and get to other business.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said all were agreed as to what was wanted, but they differed as to the means by which the desire should be effected. It had been suggested that it might be effected by the introduction of words in the Code next year, and he would undertake that this matter should be dealt with in the Code of next year in the sense in which the Committee evidently wished it to be dealt with. He could not help feeling that this course would be very much better than encumbering the Bill with the proposed words.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON contended that the responsibility for this matter should lie with the local authority and not with the Board of Education. The Committee had had the painful experience in the past of the inability of the Board of Education to enforce such a provision in its own Code. The right hon. Gentleman had previously said that the local authority would be able to override the Code, and therefore the responsibility in a matter of this kind should be laid on the local authority. Would the hon. Member the Secretary to the Board of Education undertake to put in the Code a provision that the terms of agreement come to between the managers and the teacher should be submitted for the approval of the local education authority?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON thought that when the local education authority was asked for its consent to the appointment of the teacher, it might reasonably ask to see the terms of agreement.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE advised the Committee to insist on the insertion of the Amendment in the Clause. At the moment the attention of hon. Members on both sides of the House, and the attention of the country, was fixed on this matter, and whatever pressure was brought to bear upon the Board of Education would be in the direction of getting rid of this grievance. Directly the Bill was passed, the attention which was now fixed upon the subject would be relaxed, and by the time an opportunity came for discussion of the Code, extraneous influences would be brought to bear on the Board of Education, influences very difficult for the House to deal with. It was of no use to attempt to disguise the fact, and it was only necessary to read the resolutions in reference to the Bill passed in Convocation to know whence the influence came. The terms of the contract might clear up the question of extraneous duties, but the inquiries with regard to the qualifications of the teacher would have been gone into and the man selected on the question of extraneous duties before the contract came into the matter at all. The whole question was whether these matters ought to be taken into account in the selection of the teacher. The Code and the form of contract did not affect the point. He hoped the Committee would insist on settling the matter now, and not permit it to be deferred to the Code.

MR. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) hoped that the Committee would not risk losing the substance by grasping at the shadow. Most hon. Members were in favour of the substance which was embodied in the concession of the Government, but many objected to the form of the Amendment. He did not agree with those who considered that the managers ought to be prevented by hard and fast legislation from taking into account the willingness or ability of a teacher to perform certain duties. He fully agreed that teaching efficiency ought not to be sacrificed for these extraneous duties, but there were many parishes the condition of which was such that as between two teachers of equal teaching ability these outside matters might very well be a determining factor. The risk of their being the determining factor should be provided against, and the Government had promised to see to that. While they all agreed as to the substance—that in no case should teaching efficiency be sacrificed to any extraneous consideration—they could not accept the hard and fast provision that extraneous matter should never be taken into account, and therefore they would have to vote against the Amendment.

MR. LOGAN (Leicestershire, Harborough) thought it quite possible to find a way out of the difficulty. Everybody admitted that it was unfair that the teacher should be asked to carry out certain duties not connected with education. He suggested, therefore, that as this was not a matter of life or death to the Government, the right hon. Gentleman should allow his followers to vote as they liked on the question. The teachers of the country would then get all they asked, viz., simple justice.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said there need really be no division. The language on the other side had been quite as strongly in favour of such an Amendment as the speeches on the Opposition side. All were agreed as to what they wanted; the question was whether it should be in the Bill or in the Code. Were they to be satisfied with a promise that it should be in the Code? Managers never read the Code right through, but they would read this Bill. It would therefore be much better that the provision should be inserted in the Bill itself.

DR. MACNAMARA was profoundly grateful to the Committee for the way in which they had considered the question, and to the Prime Minister for the attitude he had taken up. The suggestion had been made that the memorandum of agreement in the Code should be strengthened so as to render it impossible for these encroachments to be made matters precedent to appointment. He knew what he was talking about in these matters, and he declared that the undertaking given by the Parliamentary Secretary would, from his point of view, and from the point of view of the teaching profession, be an admirable settlement of this question. His view was that the promised alteration would remove this long-standing grievance, and as far he personally was concerned he asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Leave being refused,

(7.24.) Question put.

Committee divided :—Ayes, 119 ; Noes, 246. (Division List No. 430.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir John
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Samuel Evans and
Sir Edward Strachey.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow)
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-

Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliott, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W (Bury S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis Alexander
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Henry Pike Darlington
Peel, Hon Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

It being after half-past seven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the proceedings of the Committee.

Whereupon MR. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the word "school," in line 17, inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

(7.38.) Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause to the word "school," in line 17, inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 242; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 431.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Captain C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V C W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thomas H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon, Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky, Rt Hon. William Edw. H
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E. (Wigt'n
Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin

Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHn. J. G. (Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson, DrE. C(Monagh'n, N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. SirCEH. (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. SirWilliamH.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E(Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H(Ashton-und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E. R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, CharlesP. (Glouc., Stroud
Asquith, RtHonHerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sidney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. CharlesSeale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir JosephF. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, SirCharlesM. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, RtHn. C R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings)
Thomas, J A(Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, SirJT. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

(7.48.) Question put accordingly, "That the words of the Clause to the word 'school,' in line 17, inclusive, stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 232; Noes, 106. (Division List No. 432.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A(Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.

Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, SirJohnCharlesReady
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dorington,Rt.Hon.Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke,Rt.Hn.SirWilliam Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon.AilwynEdward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst,Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen,Hon.George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene,SirEW(B'ryS Edmunds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Rt HnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.)
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard,John(Kent,Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt.Hon.Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence,Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky,Rt.Hn.WilliamEdw.H.
Lee,Athur H.(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockie, John
Long, Col. Chas.W.(Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Milner,Rt.Hn.SirFrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More, Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray,Col. Wyndham(Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt.Hon.Chas.Thomson
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(IsleofWight)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,James Parker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,Hn.Arthur(Ormskirk)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,Sir MarkJ.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson,DrE.C(Monagh'n,N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.EH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond,RtHn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, SirCharles G.E.(Notts.)
Whiteley, H.(Ashton-und.Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William(Gateshead)
Allen,Charles P.(Glouc.,Stroud
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight

Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone,RtHn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt,Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill,Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorgeSmyth
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton,Captain Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert Williams
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pirie, Duncan V.
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHn.C.R(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings)
Thomas,J A (Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York,W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Cawley, and Mr. Robert Wallace.

Whereupon the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

(9.0.) SIR WILLIAM ANSON moved to insert in sub-Section (*d*) after "the managers of the school," the following words, "shall provide the school-house free of any charge, except for the teacher's dwelling-house, if any, to the local education authority for use as a public elementary school and." This was intended to make it clear that, whether the school-house was owned by the managers in fee simple, or let to the managers on a lease, or simply hired by them at a rent, these managers must provide the school; and, that being done, the school was a school "not provided" by the local authority. The Government had hoped it had been made perfectly clear that the payment of any rent whatsoever for a school made it a school provided by the local authority, but in order to satisfy hon. Members they now proposed to insert these additional words. There was a certain ambiguity in the word "school-house." In the Act of 1870 it was defined to include the teacher's dwelling-house; but the managers of the denominational schools were not bound to provide more than the premises for the school. The local authority had to keep up the school, and if they did not provide the teacher with a dwelling-house they would be bound to increase his salary. Therefore, if in the school-house there should be, as often was the case, a teacher's dwelling-house, the managers would not be bound to provide that free of charge, because, if so, that would be making a contribution towards the maintenance of the school. Therefore, the Government had included in the Amendment the words, not originally on the Paper, "except for the teacher's dwelling-house, if any." This would enable the managers to charge a rent for the use of the teacher's dwelling-house, and would also lay upon the managers the obligation of putting that dwelling, where there was one, at the disposal of the local education authority. By the insertion of these words regarding the teacher's dwelling-house he had anticipated an Amendment of the hon. Member for Leominster, which proposed to interpret "school-house" as "not including the teacher's dwelling."

MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth): Who is to fix the rent for the teacher's dwelling?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Surely it is reasonable to suppose that the managers can agree as to that with the local authority.

MR. LANGLEY (Sheffield, Attercliffe): Is it to be optional or compulsory on the part of the education authority to take the house?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Optional, I should say. If they prefer it, they can find a residence for the teacher away from the school.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 17, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'shall provide the school house free of any charge, except for the teacher's dwelling-house if any, to the local education authority for use as a public elementary school and.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said the original Amendment seemed innocuous, but he confessed that the speech of the Secretary to the Education Department and the new words had not made it more acceptable. What they wanted to make clear was that during the whole time of school hours the school buildings and school rooms should be entirely at the disposal of the local authority. He was afraid these words would involve a very inconvenient limitation. But the most serious objection he had to raise was to the acceptance by the Government of an Amendment, in the name of one of their own followers, which entitled the trustees or owners to charge rent if the teacher's house formed part of the school buildings. That seemed to him totally contrary to what they had understood to be the object of the Bill. They had always supposed the intention to be to give the local authority whole control over the buildings during school hours, as far as secular educational work was concerned. This would interfere with that, and he was very sorry indeed that the Government had accepted the Amendment. Who was to decide the amount of rent? Innumerable questions might arise which would lead to inevitable and intolerable conflict. It might be that the trustees or owners might demand an exorbitant rent and the local authority might find itself in the position of being unable to obtain the necessary buildings for the proper working of the school.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN: I have handed in a written Amendment dealing with this point. Can it be taken now?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The Amendment seems to deal with the question of the master's house in an inverse sense to that held by the Secretary to the Board of Education.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN: Not only the master's house but other premises as well which are usually connected with a school-house.

DR. MACNAMARA said the alteration of the Government Amendment would make it necessary for him—if, of course, it were carried—to move the deletion of certain added words.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE suggested that the Committee should first deal with the original Amendment of the Secretary to the Education Board. What was really wanted was a clear definition of the word "school-house."

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the Government took the definition of school-house from the Act of 1870. Therefore he did not imagine that there would be any dispute as to the first few words of his Amendment. He suggested that the Amendment should be accepted down to and including the words "free of any charge," and then the hon. Member for Montgomeryshire might move his Amendment.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL pointed out that the Act of 1870 defined the term school-house as including the teacher's house and all offices and premises belonging thereto.

SIR JAMES RANKIN (Herefordshire, Leominster) said the object of his Amendment was to get a clear expression of opinion from the Government on the point.

*THE CHAIRMAN: And it is the acceptance of the hon. Member's Amendment that has caused all the trouble.

SIR JAMES RANKIN: But my Amendment has not been embodied in the Government Amendment. The Secretary to the Education Board has not adopted the words "shall provide." My main point is whether the managers shall provide teachers' dwellings or not. The Bill does not say they are not to.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE: We understand the Government to agree that the term school-house does not include the teacher's dwelling-house.

SIR JAMES RANKIN: And I want to make it clear that the managers are not to be under the liability to provide a teacher's dwelling in any case.

MR. ROBERT SPENCER (Northamptonshire, Mid): Has the Amendment of the hon. Member for Leominster been accepted?

*THE CHAIRMAN: It has been incorporated in the Government Amendment.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the Government had never desired to depart from the definition of school-house given in the Act of 1870.

MR. WHITLEY remarked that if the Government Amendment as amended were passed it would place many of them under a serious disability by cutting out some very important Amendments.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member for Montgomeryshire had better move his Amendment now.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN moved to insert after the word "school-house" the words "together with all buildings and all other hereditaments usually occupied or enjoyed therewith." He said it was within his knowledge that in the case of many rural schools the outbuildings were scattered about, and sometimes separated altogether from the school-house and buildings. In order that there might not be disputes as to the property which actually passed from the managers to the local authority, he begged to move the Amendment. The words he proposed would include, for instance, the right to fetch water from a well or access to necessary buildings not in the ownership of the trustees.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment.—

"After the word 'schoolhouse' to insert the words 'together with all buildings and all other hereditaments usually occupied or enjoyed therewith.'"—(*Mr. Humphreys-Owen.*)

Question proposed, "That those words stand part of the proposed Amendment."

SIR WILLIAM ANSON was afraid he must oppose this Amendment. He thought it was much better to retain the definition of the school-house as given in the Act of 1870. The Government only proposed to depart from that definition so far as to declare how much of the premises were to be found free of charge. Otherwise they did not intend to depart from the definition.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL agreed that it would be better to adhere to the definition contained in the Act of 1870. If there were two definitions it might lead to considerable difficulty of which ingenious counsel would make much.

SIR WILLIAM TOMLINSON (Preston) said there was danger that the words would be construed as making it the duty of the managers to provide the dwelling house. In the vast majority of the schools there was no dwelling house attached.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE thought it would be better to stick to the definition contained in the Act of 1870.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN said that if the Attorney-General could assure him that the two instances he gave were covered by the definition in the Act of 1870 he would withdraw his Amendment.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the definition included "offices and all premises belonging to or acquired for the school."

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN: Then I ask leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment to proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR JAMES RANKIN asked if his Amendment should not come next.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me it has been accepted by the Government and moved by them.

SIR JAMES RANKIN said the Government had not accepted it to the extent that managers were not to be called upon to provide the teacher's dwelling.

(9.30.) MR. BRYCE said he understood that where there was no teacher's house the obligation would not lie upon the managers to build one, but where there was a teacher's house it was to be provided as part of the school.

SIR JAMES RANKIN thought it would be most unfair if those who had provided a school-house should not have the advantage of it. In cases where there did not exist a school-house the local authority should pay an additional salary so that he might rent a convenient house. The words suggested would satisfy him if the managers were not under an obligation to provide a teacher's dwelling.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that was made quite plain by his Amendment, "Except for the teacher's dwelling, if any." He thought that also met the objection of the hon. Baronet the Member for Preston, who seemed to have confused the terms "school-house" and "teacher's dwelling house."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said the question was whether the provision of a teacher's dwelling was part of the equipment of a school for elementary teaching. In the charge of the Archbishop of Canterbury he assured his clergy that, under no circumstances, would they have to subscribe anything at all. He said that they were not going to be liable even for the ordinary repairs of the schools, and he stated that it would only be under extraordinary circumstances that they would be called upon to pay anything. He thought this spirit of shabbiness on the part of the richest religious community in the world in respect of their paltry contributions was shocking. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!" and "Question."] He was perfectly in order in what he had said, and he had a right to say that it was showing a spirit of shabbiness not to give up the school-house without a statutory consideration, and, endeavouring to contract out of the liability of providing a house for the teacher, which was the most necessary part of the school. It seemed to him shocking. They wanted to have everything for nothing. [Ministerial interruptions and cries of "That's what you want."] It seemed to him that the people who were bound to supply the school, and who were to have a majority of two to one in the management of the school, should also be bound to supply a school-house for the teacher. Did any one know the real condition of a great number of the small village schools in this country? It was absolutely necessary that there should be a school-house for the teacher attached to the school. This was just as necessary as the school itself. Of all the things created in this Bill the most extraordinary thing is this shabby attempt of the Church to get rid of its liability of providing a house for the teacher. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!"] It was to his mind perfectly shocking. He thought that a great many other people would think so too when they realised that the Church of England claimed, on account of its bricks and mortar contribution, that they should have for ever a statutory majority of two to one in the management of the school, and then endeavour, upon this Amendment, to escape the liability of providing a dwelling for the teacher in order to secure the few pounds which they would get for the rent of this school-house. This Amendment threw a light upon the spirit and the purpose with which this Bill was inspired. This was a demand which was utterly unjustifiable, and he should resist this Amendment as far as he could.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the right hon. Gentleman opposite had just told the Committee that the Archbishop of Canterbury had said something which was shocking. What he was perfectly certain of was that the greater part of the remarks of his right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouthshire were absolutely irrelevant to the Amendment under consideration. [Opposition cries of "Oh, oh!"] The situation was a very simple one if the right hon. Gentleman would consider the case. They had very often in a country village a teacher's house provided as part of the school building, and they might have cases in which there might be difficulty in finding another house for the teacher. The Amendment of his hon. friend would have the effect of requiring that the managers should put at the disposal of the local education authority, not only the school-house, but also the teacher's dwelling house attached to the school. That disposed of the first charge. He was only referring to charges made by the right hon Gentleman which had any relevance whatever to the Amendment. The second charge was, "Are you going to charge a rent for it?" Of course the managers ought to have a rent for it.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Why?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said if the right hon. Gentleman would give two minutes dispassionate consideration he would see that if the teacher got a school-house thrown in he would get a less salary. If he got £150 a year plus a house, he would expect £170 or £180, or whatever might be a fair rent for the house, in case he had to provide it himself. In many cases there were no teachers' dwelling houses at all.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Then the managers ought to build one.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said the most convenient course was, in such a case, to give the teacher a higher salary and let him provide the dwelling house for himself. The right hon. Gentleman had said that it was a piece of shabbiness that the managers should not give a part of the salary. Did he suggest that the managers should be bound to build a dwelling house for the teacher where one did not exist at the present time? [An Hon. Member: That is not the Amendment.] He was simply dealing now with the strictures of the right hon. Gentleman. It would be perfectly preposterous to place on the managers the obligation to build a teacher's dwelling in cases where it did not already exist, for the simple reason that it would be more convenient to rent a house somewhere in the neighbourhood for the teacher. He should strenuously oppose any such Amendment as that put forward, which would compel the managers to put up a teacher's dwelling house. The Amendment proposed by his hon. friend exactly hit the justice of the case. It prevented any managers from withholding the teacher's dwelling house from the use of the teacher, and entitled them to a fair payment by way of rent because the letting of the dwelling house to the teacher would reduce the salary which would have to be paid to the teacher by the local authority.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: Who will fix the the rent?

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said it seemed to be a fixed idea with hon. Gentlemen opposite that in everything which concerned this Bill everybody would act in the most unreasonable way possible. [An Hon. Member: Will they agree upon the rent?] Of course they would, because they were reasonable people, and in case of any dispute the Board of Education would intervene.

Dr. MACNAMARA said the great majority of the teachers' dwellings attached to voluntary schools were given to the teachers free of rent, and he thought the Government ill represented the Church of England if they said that, in the altered condition of things, the Church of England should charge a rent for those dwellings.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: The rent is to be charged to the local authority, for if the teacher is provided with a house he will not receive so much salary from the local education authority.

Dr. MACNAMARA said he did not imagine that the teacher was involved at all, but, as he understood the question, in future the local authority would be charged a rent for a building which had hitherto been used rent free.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON pointed out that in the past the teacher's dwelling had affected the salary, and it would continue to affect it when the schools came under the local education authority. He did not think they were entitled to ask the managers to contribute that portion.

DR. MACNAMARA said that at present the denominationalists found the school buildings and residences for the teachers. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Not all of them."] The teachers used the school-house rent free. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Yes, but that affects their salaries."] No doubt it was so. The point of the matter was that the teacher's salary would remain the same as at present. Therefore, what would happen as a practical issue would be this—that, where in the past a building had been used by the teacher with no rent paid, in the future the trustees or managers would get a rent for that for which in the past they had got no rent at all. The Government ill represented the Church of England in such a proposal. He did not think the Church desired to drive a hard bargain. Now the Attorney General and the Permanent Secretary to the Board of Education argued that in consequence of having had these residences rent free lower salaries had been fixed. Did they think that the teacher's salary would be changed? The teacher would remain the same person, and he did not think that any change would be made in the salary. What would happen would be that where in the past a building had been used by the teacher rent free, in future the denominationalist trustees would get a rent for that building. He did not think the teacher's salary would be modified at all. Did the Attorney General suggest that the local authority would agree to make up this rent by an increase in the teacher's salary?

(9.45.) SIR ROBERT FINLAY replied that if the voluntary schools gave the teacher a house, at the present time they gave him so much less salary. When the local authority took over the school, if they got the house for the use of the teacher, they would continue to pay him so much less salary. It was obvious that if they got the salary reduced they should recoup the owners of the house, who enabled the local authority to obtain a teacher at a lower salary.

DR. MACNAMARA contended that the teacher would still get the same salary, and he did not think by this proposal they were representing the views of the Church of England. He was quite sure that where the Church in the past had provided a building free of rent they were prepared to continue that in the future. He should have thought it would not have paid a great National Church to drive a hard bargain like this and be rather haggling in a small matter of this kind. He thought the word "shabby" was very well used in connection with these proceedings.

* (9.50.) SIR FRANCIS POWELL pointed out that the Legislature had already drawn a distinction between the school building and the part used as the teacher's dwelling. The Act exempting elementary school from rates laid down that the school dwelling was rated and had to pay rates. Therefore it was clear from that Act that the Legislature had drawn a distinction between the school buildings and the dwelling. He knew a case where a teacher had ceased to reside in the official dwelling, and her wages had been reassessed. That was a proof that the value of the dwelling was taken into consideration when the salaries were fixed. Everyone who knew the working of the School Board system in London, Bradford, and all great towns, knew that the dwellings were not part of the school premises, and the teachers were paid a higher salary when they had to provide their own residences. He was astonished to hear that great educationists sitting opposite did not seem to have the most practical elementary knowledge upon this subject. As regarded the remarks made by the hon. Member for Poplar, who stated that there would be a difficulty in finding out the rent——

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: In fixing it.

* SIR FRANCIS POWELL thought the hon. Member did not give the education authorities much credit for

business capacity. A teacher's dwelling was like any other dwelling, and any other person acquainted with the management of property would have no difficulty in fixing the rent. He regretted that in dealing with a matter like this, which was really somewhat of a commercial character, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire should fulminate against the Church of England. He could not see how those fulminations had any relevance to the matter under discussion. He had not read the charge of the Archbishop of Canterbury, but if his Grace had said that the charge for the maintenance of those buildings would be a light one his statement was not based upon careful consideration of the facts. The cost imposed by this Bill upon voluntary schools would be a heavy, serious, and a growing charge, and he felt quite sure that as far as the Church of England was concerned Churchmen would spend money upon this object to the utmost of their capacity. Instead of making this serious attack upon the Church of England, he thought the right hon. Gentleman ought to be grateful to the Church for the educational work it had accomplished.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT reminded the hon. Baronet that the Archbishop had expressed the view that it would only be in exceptional cases, where a large improvement had to be undertaken, that the subscribers would be called upon in future for any subscriptions at all.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: That is not the Amendment before us.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said it was part of the same thing. It was a provision for paying the repairs out of the schoolmaster's house, which, he contended, was an essential part of the educational equipment of the school. And, as to introducing a commercial matter into the discussion, that was not the fault of the Opposition, but of the Government and those who inspired them. When they built a new school in the country, who was to build a dwelling-house for the schoolmaster? A school without a house for the master would be utterly insufficient. Really, to claim as a right the appointment of the teacher, and then to say that the teacher's house was no concern of the managers, was one of the most extraordinary propositions he had ever heard.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON rose to a point of order. He asked whether they should not discuss one thing at a time, namely, the point raised by the proposal now before the Committee.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I called upon the hon. Member for North Camberwell to make his speech, but he did not move his Amendment.

DR. MACNAMARA said he understood that the Amendment did not include the teacher's dwelling-house.

*THE CHAIRMAN: What we have been discussing—perhaps the Committee will be surprised to hear it—is the Amendment of the Secretary of the Board of Education.

MR. WHITLEY moved an Amendment omitting the words from the Government Amendment "except for the teacher's dwelling-house, if any." He thought this Amendment would bring the subject to a clear issue. He did not propose to go back to the subject whether rent was part of salary or not. The ground he took was—Is it, or is it not, part of the bargain that these schools should be provided without any charge, including the master's house which had always been taken to be part of the school premises? [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] There was a bargain made with the Bishops. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University told them a little about it in a speech to his constituents the other day. He would be very much surprised if the right hon. Gentleman were to get up and say to the Committee that it was not understood when the Bill was drawn, that what the Church brought into the hotchpot, as lawyers said, was the whole of the educational equipment for the purposes of elementary education, including the master's house where there was one. He could prove his contention in this way. The figures quoted by hon. Gentlemen opposite, when speaking in the country as to the sacrifices made in the great amount of money spent in years past on educational purposes, in every case included the money for the teachers' houses. He would go so far as to say, without fear of contradiction by any one who had a share in the drawing up of the Bill, that it was originally intended that the whole of the hereditament should be given free of charge in return for having four of the six members in the managing body, and in his judgment it was rather mean to charge a rent for the schoolmaster's house. The result would be that in many places the Church would get a money value out of the Bill sufficient to provide an additional curate in addition to the two to one majority on the Board of school management.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'except for the teacher's dwelling-house, if any.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said that the simple business question was this—Is it right, as has been assumed, that under this Bill the salary of the teacher is to come out of the public funds? Hon. Members opposite had based a large number of their arguments against the Bill on the allegation that the whole of the salary of the teacher was to come from public funds, and that he ought not to be appointed to denominational schools by denominational managers. If it was true that the salary of the teacher was to come out of public funds, it was clear that the Amendment of the Secretary of the Board of Education was right.

MR. M'KENNA said if the hon. and learned Gentleman was in the House yesterday when a speech was made by the noble Lord the Member for the Biggleswade Division he would know that they were told they were in error in supposing that the teachers' salaries were to be met by public funds. The noble Lord developed the argument by stating that as the buildings were being transferred to the local authority, the managers were in fact paying part of the salary. It was on that ground that the noble Lord got the support of many members, and now, the day after the battle, the hon. and learned Gentleman came and told the Committee that the salaries were to be paid out of public funds. Why were the Government playing fast and loose with this matter? The Act of 1870 laid down that the school-house included the master's house, if any. He believed he was justified in saying that the action of the Government was a shabby and mean proceeding. They had represented to the country that they were going to get a certain asset from the denominational schools and that asset was now being reduced. What the Government were now proposing was to make money out of the local authorities; in other words, they were asking that those authorities should pay the managers for the dwelling-houses. He trusted the Committee would adhere to the definition in the Act of 1870.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said this difficulty would never have arisen but for the definition in the Act of 1870, which included in the term "school-house," the teacher's dwelling. He ventured to think that many Members of the House, and many people outside, never knew until this discussion arose that the definition included the teacher's house. It was really absurd to make capital out of the fact that the term school-house was originally inserted in the Bill. The term "school-house" was not intended to be interpreted according to the definition in the Act of 1870, and to insist upon that by adopting the Amendment to the Amendment would be to throw an unfair burden on the managers of the denominational schools.

MR. PERKS said this was a question which affected the Wesleyan Church as well as the Established Church, and certainly the managers of the Wesleyan schools, in all about 500, never entertained the idea that they were going to receive rent for the teacher's house. In the county of Lincoln almost all the teachers' dwellings were part of the school buildings, and in many cases building grants from the State had been received, not merely for the school, but for the teacher's house. It therefore seemed to him that it was going back on a bargain for the Government to suggest in the interests, not of the Wesleyans or the Roman Catholics, but of the Church of England, that in respect of the teacher's house rental should be paid, which manifestly must go as an endowment to some Church institution in the village. It seemed to him, regarding this as a business transaction, when they had to balance the question as to who was to pay the burden, the County Council or the Anglican Church, that the Amendment was a just one.

(10.20.) COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) said he thought hon. Gentlemen opposite did not take a sound view of this question. It was possible that they had too many leaders, and not one. He had come most distinctly to the conclusion that the very best thing that could happen was that the local education authority should pay rent for the teacher's house because it would give that body more control. If they wanted the new education system to work well, the more the local authority paid the better, because it would give them more control. That was absolute commonsense, and he thought that the denominational managers and the proprietors of the schools were making a mistake in pressing their opposition to the Amendment. If they had a sense of logic they would not boggle at the Amendment, but swallow it at once. He should vote for the Amendment. He suggested to the hon Gentlemen opposite that they were rather on the wrong tack in this matter and that they should consent to the payment of the rent of the teacher's house in order to get control over him.

MR. BRYCE said that his hon. friend, the Member for East Somerset, seemed to argue that this difficulty had arisen because no one knew the definition of a school-house given in the Act of 1870 until this Amendment came up for discussion. But surely the draftsman of the Bill, and the Attorney General, and the First Lord of the Treasury knew the definition in that Act. They all remembered that when the First Lord introduced the Bill he told the House that the consideration which was being given for the Bill by the denominations was the provision of the school buildings and their repairs. When the right hon. Gentleman said that, everybody took him to mean buildings in the sense in which the phrase had been previously used; that was in the sense in which the phrase was defined in 1870. It was not a fair way to treat the Committee to depart from the bargain held out to Parliament and the country in April last. The Government Amendment now effected a complete alteration of the terms on which the Bill was recommended to the country. He agreed with the hon. Member for Newton that the more the local authority paid the better would be their control, but he questioned whether the local authority would acquiesce in a system which would shift the burden of repairs from the managers to them. He maintained that this was an unfortunate proposal in the interests of the Bill and of the Church of England itself, and he believed that the Government would later on regret the proposal.

SIR JAMES RANKIN said it seemed to him the very height of injustice to those who had been generous enough to build the school-house in conjunction with the school itself, that they should not have the benefit when the local authority took over the school. He believed that until the debate that night not a single word had been spoken by a Minister or a Leader of the Opposition mentioning that a teacher's dwelling-house was part of the school buildings. If it were laid down that all these poor parishes must provide teachers' dwellings as well as school buildings, it would be a sure way to turn quickly the denominational schools into provided schools. He therefore thought that, in justice to the denominational schools, the Amendment of the Secretary to the Education Department ought to be carried, and he hoped that the Committee would support it.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN said that the hon. Gentleman who had moved the Amendment forgot that this was a new bargain—that those who provided the school-houses and the dwellings were going to be relieved, under the Bill, of a burden of something like £800,000 a year. On that ground, he insisted that the public should have the whole of the plant and apparatus by means of which elementary education had hitherto been carried on.

SIR HENRY FOWLER said that he wanted to put a question to the Government, and also to the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. It was alleged that the intention of the Government from the first was that rent should be paid for the teachers' dwelling-houses. Let him call attention to the Bill as originally introduced. Clause 18, sub-Section 3, set forth that—

> "In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, any expression to which a special meaning is attached, in the Elementary Education Acts, 1870 to 1900, shall have the same meaning in this Act."

Now, there was an expression in the Act of 1870 which said that "school-house" was taken to include the teacher's dwelling. But it was not until the Secretary to the Education Department placed his Amendment on the Paper that this exception was brought before the Committee in any shape or form. That was not the original proposal of the Government. It was not in the Government Bill. Why was it now proposed? He did not think it was a proposal so much in the interests of the Church as in the interests of the owners of property. He knew that in Scotland the schoolmaster's house was universally attached to the school-house, and he believed that it was so in most cases in England. It was part of the equipment and plant which was to be handed over to the local education authority; but it was not until four or five months after the Bill had been introduced that a new term and a new burden had been proposed to be imposed.

MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said that according to the definition in the Act of 1870, the whole buildings, including the school-house and the teacher's dwelling, were included. If the Amendment were adopted, in large towns where the value of land was so rapidly increasing, the land owners would have the right to demand an exorbitant rent, or to take over part of the ground.

MR. YOXALL said that as a matter of fact, many of the teachers' dwelling-houses were not fit to live in. They were too small, badly lighted, and ill supplied with water. If the local authority was required to pay the rent for the use of these dwelling-houses, they should have a choice in the matter, and not to take them over if they were not in a sanitary condition.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that in answering another question on the same subject he had stated most distinctly that he did not consider the local education authority would be under any obligation to take over the teacher's dwelling-house if they did not choose to do so.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said that the Secretary to the Board of Education had stated that the local authority would not be obliged to take over the teacher's dwelling-house though it was part of the school building.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Not obliged.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Then who is to live in it?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he very much regretted that the Government had gone back on the proposal they had placed on the Paper. The previous night an hon. Gentleman opposite had objected to the appointment of the teachers by the local authority on the plea that a fair bargain had been made. He asked whether the Government, by the proposal they were now making, were not breaking a bargain. Supposing the rent was charged in respect of a schoolmaster's house where the school premises were held under the same trust deed, what would become of the rent? The educational trust was to give elementary education to the children of the poor. He wanted to know if the rent was to be given for educational purposes, or for what other purpose? Was the money to go to the Church, or to the land owners, or to the trust for elementary education? There was one other point. In some cases, in addition to the school premises, there were endowments. He would like to know whether these were to be handed over for educational or for some other purposes.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that if the Amendment was carried the rent would go to the managers' fund, and would be applicable to any object to which they could apply it within the terms of their trust. In regard to the question of endowments, that was a matter that would have to be dealt with separately. The question how they should be divided between the managers and the education authority would depend largely on the original purpose for which they were given.

Sir HENRY FOWLER said he wished that the Committee had copies of the trust deeds laid before them. He had in his possession a copy of the model trust deed of the National Society. This was the trust deed on which the land was conveyed—

> "To permit the said premises and all buildings thereon erected, or to be erected, to be for ever hereafter appropriated and used as and for a school for the education of children and adults, or children only, of the labouring, manufacturing, and other poor classes of the parish, and as a residence for the teacher or teachers of the said school, which said school shall always be in union with and conducted in furtherance of the principles of the National Society for promoting the education of the poor in the principles of the Established Church."

He thought it would be a very strong order to appropriate the income derived from such property to a private purpose.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said he thought the right hon. Gentleman would see that the money would not be devoted to any private purpose. It would be strictly applied to the purposes of the trust, and for the purposes of education. The trust was modified somewhat by changed circumstances, but it was perfectly clear that if the rent was received it would go to the managers' fund, and when applied to the repairs of the building, was really being used in furtherance of education.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON asked whether the rent would be one of the receipts mentioned in Clause 13, sub-Section 2, which said that all receipts in respect of any school should be paid to the local education authority.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said certainly not. If the hon. Gentleman would look at the sub-Section he would see that it excluded sums specially applicable for purposes for which provision was to be made by the managers.

Mr. M'KENNA asked if the right hon. Gentleman had considered Section 23 of the Act of 1870 in connection with the Amendment. He submitted that under that Section there could be no letting, except at a nominal rent.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said that Section 23 of the Act of 1870 had not the remotest application to the matter before the Committee.

(10.48.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 217; Noes, 111. (Division List, No. 433.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Lawrence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm,
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S, W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick

Gordon,Maj Evans(T'rH'mlets
Gore,HnGR.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst,Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,Sir E W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene,HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Greene,W.Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard,John(Kent,Fav'rsham
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel,Captain HerbertMerton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop
Keswick, William
Lambton,Hon.Frederick Wm.
Law,Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th

Lawson, John Grant
Lee,Arthur H(Hants,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col.Francis (Lowestoft)
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray,Col. Wyndham(Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, David Ninian
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington,Lieut.-Col.Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles

Ridley,Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert(Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler,Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seely,Maj.J.E.B(Isle ofWight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson,Dr.EC(Monagh'nN
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby,Lt.-ColA.C.E(Taunton
Whiteley,H(Ashton-und-Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A.Stanley (York,E.R.
Wortley, Rt. Hon.C.B.Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, SirWilliam(Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Roland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brown,George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward

Evans,Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt,Rt.Hon. Sir William
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter,Rt.Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill,Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington

Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Middlemore,JohnThrogmort'n
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moss, Samuel
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John

Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glam'rgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

(11.0.) DR. MACNAMARA moved to insert in line 2, after the word "free" "for all educational purposes," and if that were accepted he would afterwards move to omit all the words after "authority." They had been told that the use of the school buildings was part of the bargain which had been struck between the public and the denominational system; but after what had happened during the evening he believed that before the contract was sealed one of the parties to it would relent. The denominationalists were giving the use of their schools and an undertaking to keep them in repair; the public, on the other hand, were paying the whole of the cost of maintenance and had conceded four-sixths of the management to the denominationalists, and also the right to continue denominational teaching, although the whole cost of maintenance was provided from public funds. He thought it was hard that a great national Church, of which he spoke with great respect, should begin to haggle over the bargain in the way they had heard; and he thought that the Government were doing the Church a very ill service in allowing it to haggle as to the extent to which the buildings should be used. He was aware that Dr. Temple had stated that the annually recurring repairs would be taken out of the rates. That was an addition to the bargain of which he was very sorry to hear. The Question before the Committee was, what was meant by the words "for use as a public elementary school." He understood that the Bill was for the purpose of co-ordinating all forms of education, but directly they found the money, then co-ordination was off. When the money was to be found there was to be co-ordination to any extent, but when it came to the use of the buildings, then co-ordination was to cease. He resisted the proposal on one ground only. According to the Bill, all night school work was other than public elementary education. Therefore, under the Bill, if they were to have the use of the buildings for public elementary education only, the local authority, if they desired to run a night school, would be charged rent for the use of the buildings for that work. He called that preposterous, and he would cite, in support of his contention, the right hon. Gentleman the late Vice-President, who said that the buildings should be had free of charge for ordinary night school work. The great bulk of that work was purely elementary education. It might be defined in the Bill as other than elementary, but that did not make it higher education. Was it conceivable that the Church desired to charge rent for the use of the buildings for ordinary elementary night school work. That would be the effect of the Bill unless amended. The rent which would be charged for the use of the building to be used as the teacher's residence, plus the amount of money that would have to be paid for the use of the buildings for all education other than elementary, would easily cover the whole cost of the repairs. He did not believe that the Church desired to drive such a hard bargain with the local authority, and he trusted the Government would not do the Church the ill service of insisting on it. The least they could ask, and the least the Church and the Government ought to give, was that for all public educational purposes—elementary, higher, or technical—they ought to have the buildings rent free. He should have thought that in a Bill the main purpose of which was the co-ordination of education, the Church would gladly and willingly agree to give the public authority the use of the buildings free for all public educational purposes.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 2, after the word 'free' to insert the words 'for all educational purposes.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not believe that there was any difference between the two sides of the Committee on the subject. They had to deal at the present moment with school-houses which were the absolute property of the existing owners, but which were to be used for educational purposes during the hours in which elementary education was to be carried on within their walls. On that they were all agreed, and they had provided the buildings free of charge during these hours. Then came the question as to whether they ought to use the buildings for any purpose outside these hours. He quite agreed that it was probably desirable, in the educational interests of many districts, that the unprovided schools should be used in the evening for the purposes of continuation schools and other analogous purposes. That was quite true, and he was sure every hon. Gentleman would agree with him up to that point. But that was not the whole case. But they had also to remember that these schools were used for parochial purposes, and a great many other admirable purposes connected with the social life of the district, and if every evening was used, or if there was the power to use every evening by the education authority for purposes in which the owners of the schools were not interested, they might be doing a great injury and injustice to the trustees and managers of those schools, and to the denomination at whose cost they were built. [HON. MEMBERS: Partially built.] They would not go into that ancient controversy. What they had got to do was to find a compromise between these two perfectly legitimate views, and the only compromise which he thought would meet both the case of the education authority and that of the owners of the schools was that the education authority might use the schools for educational purposes on not more than three nights a week. That would cover the requirements of the local authority for educational purposes, and would leave the schools open for the use of the trustees and managers for purposes connected with village life, and for the purposes of the denomination whose requirements ought to be considered. The hon. Gentleman was in error in saying that the Government were anxious to obtain rent for the schools for evenings on which they might be used for educational purposes. He would not suggest that. He thought it was fair that there should be a rent for the teacher's residences, but he also thought that in those cases where the education authority could not find accommodation elsewhere — that was the important point—they should have the right to use those schools for three nights a week rent free. He ventured to suggest that the Committee should adopt the view he had expressed.

MR. BRYCE asked if the right hon. Gentleman proposed to move the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would be prepared to move an Amendment to carry out the general policy he had adumbrated.

DR. MACNAMARA asked if he understood the right hon. Gentleman to state that if the public authority wanted the school for any educational purpose whatever [MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.] for three nights a week it was to have it rent free?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said provided, of course, that the public authority had no schools of their own in which to carry out the same object.

SIR WILLIAM MATHER (Lancashire, Rossendale) said that at present board schools in large towns were used six night a week for continuation classes; and he asked how was it possible to have a public elementary school, in any sense of the word, where the work was restricted to three nights a week.

MR. WHITLEY said he was greatly interested in evening schools, and thought that as far as they were concerned the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman would meet the case; but there were other questions to be considered. For instance, it might be desirable that certain ex-voluntary schools should be used for higher grade education; and unless the words in the Amendment were modified, the managers would be able to charge rent for that purpose. He protested strongly against limiting the right to use the buildings in cases where no other room was available. The schools were to be handed over for educational purposes to the local authority, in return for great privileges; and he did not think that the local authority ought to be put under the liability of finding other schools if they possibly could. The day school was the natural place in which to hold continuation classes; and, certainly, if they only asked for its use for three nights a week, without any further qualification, he thought their demand was very moderate and reasonable.

LORD HUGH CECIL said the proposal of his right hon. friend did not sound in his ears as an unreasonable one, but he thought it right to point out to the Committee that it was not a question of what they themselves might think was reasonable or unreasonable. There was a certain danger that if these matters were piled one upon another, if concession after concession were made, that there might come a point at which a large number of managers might refuse to go on with their schools. The proposal seemed perfectly reasonable to him. He thought it was certainly desirable that the schools should be used for educational purposes, assuming that they were legitimate and *bonâ fide*; but he had observed, in some instances, that the patience of the managers was running out, and that there was an increasing opinion that the Bill was not such a very good Bill. Though no doubt it relieved the managers from the hard task of raising considerable sums of money, yet it put upon them disabilities, inconveniences, and in some instances humiliations, to which they were not accustomed. Was it desirable that there should be a general, or anything like a general, repudiation of the Bill by existing school managers? He did not know what hon. Members opposite might say in their controversial moments, but in their uncontroversial moments he believed they did not desire to throw on the ratepayers the great cost of replacing the existing voluntary school buildings. He did not think that they would find that very popular. Further, he was quite sure that his hon. friend would very much deplore the great denominational system suddenly, or to any very large extent collapsing. They themselves were able to view these matters calmly and dispassionately; but they should not press them too far, or forget that there were others to be considered who did not always take a perfectly calm view, and who might easily take the bit between their teeth and upset the education system of the country. Having uttered that word of caution, he would suggest to the Government that it would be very desirable at the proper opportunity to carry out the assurance which had been given time after time, that the ownership of the buildings would not be affected by the Bill, and to insert express words saving the ownership—not only saving it in law, but making it manifest to everybody that it was saved. That might have a soothing effect on the minds of managers. Everyone would agree that the schools existed for educational purposes; and, further, that there was really no controversy between the supporters of the schools and their opponents as to the importance of education, or that it was not most desirable that the buildings could be used in the evenings to advance higher education or any other legitimate educational purpose.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that, although he did not always agree with his noble friend with regard to the controversies raised by the Bill, he agreed with him absolutely in everything he had just said. He agreed that there were many owners of voluntary schools who would be tempted to say, he thought quite erroneously, "If all these limitations and disabilities are to be put upon us, why should we give up our buildings at all. Why should we not throw on the district the whole cost of providing elementary education, and use our buildings for our own purposes?" That was a real possibility, and, although hon. Gentlemen opposite would not agree with him, he thought a real danger in the present Bill. All he could say was that while he perfectly recognised that the scheme of the Government required great sacrifices from the owners and managers of voluntary schools, he quite agreed that voluntary schools *in extremis* would have nothing but gain from the Bill, although many voluntary schools would lose largely. To all he would say that they should sacrifice their relatively personal and individual views in order to carry out the general scheme of education which the Bill provided. He understood his noble friend to say that he did not dissent from the Government in thinking that three nights a week was not an unreasonable compromise. Private owners were being asked to give up their buildings without fee or reward for educational purposes, which were not legally associated with elementary education at all, and he thought that the Committee should recognise that that was a sacrifice.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said he was surprised that the proposal was spoken of as if it were something new. The buildings were already taken under two Acts of Parliament for the use of candidates at elections. Surely that was a public purpose. [HON. MEMBERS: "They are paid for."]

(11.30.) LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE said he thought the concession made by the Prime Minister was a perfectly reasonable one. The evening continuation schools were now regarded as secondary schools, but he asked anyone who knew anything about continuation schools in country districts whether they were not, in reality, public elementary schools. They were used to teach children of agricultural labourers who were irregular in their attendance at the day schools, who had forgotten nearly everything they had learned, and who came to the continuation schools to recover a little of their lost knowledge. Could such a school be called a secondary school? His hon. friend the Member for the Rossendale Division referred to the large towns, but they had to consider the case of the country districts also. In the large towns there would be the old School Board buildings, and although, no doubt, it might be very desirable to have the use of the non-provided schools on every evening in the week, he thought, however, it would be wise to accept the concession of the right hon. Gentleman, because in the country districts three evenings a week might prove sufficient, and in the large towns there would be the provided as well as the non-provided schools. The noble Lord who had addressed the Committee said that they might find that the owners of the non-provided schools might be inclined to throw up the Bill altogether and let the country face the great expense of purchasing the schools. He did not claim to speak for anyone but himself, but he thought that was what his hon. friends would desire. He said unhesitatingly that the further they went with the Bill through Committee, the more it could be seen how absolutely absurd it was to try and make a school at the same time a non-provided and a provided school, a sort of school which was neither fish, flesh, nor good red herring. He believed that the whole system was likely to break down, and that the only logical solution was, as Lord Salisbury said, "Buy them."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said, with reference to a challenge that was made from the other side of the House, that he had now verified the matter, and there was no doubt whatever as to the absolute accuracy of the statement that there were seven different purposes for which these schools could now be used free of charge in every case.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) said that the hon. Member for North Camberwell had referred to the bargain between the public and the owners of the denominational schools. He thought, however, that the Opposition might accept the concession which had been offered by his right hon. friend, especially as he had always understood that the hon. Member for North Camberwell was of opinion that the Bill ought to pass, and also because of the fact that the bargain, from the point of view of the Opposition, had been very much improved.

DR. MACNAMARA said he had not yet been able to see the precise terms of the Amendment of the First Lord of the Treasury, but he understood from the right hon. Gentleman's statement that the public authority was to have the use, free of rent, of the buildings three nights a week for educational purposes.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Where they have not their own buildings.

DR. MACNAMARA said it might be as well to have the exact words before proceeding further, and he would, therefore, withdraw his Amendment.

MR. WHITLEY said that two important questions had been raised. One was that the words "public elementary schools" excluded higher grade work, and the other was the restriction foreshadowed by the right hon. Gentleman that the buildings could only be used if no other premises were available. He hoped both points would not be overlooked.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the provision of schools for other educational work would not be governed by the words "public elementary school" in his Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR understood the hon. Gentleman to be reluctant to withdraw the Amendment until he knew what the substitute was to be. He proposed, after the word "school" to insert "and also for other educational purposes if the local education authority have no other suitable accommodation, but not oftener than three days a week."

SIR WILLIAM MATHER: What is meant by "other suitable accommodation?"

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In schools belonging to themselves. I do not mean that they should go into the open market and hire rooms. But if they have provided schools under their own control, I think it is rather unfair that they should come upon the non-provided school when it is really not necessary.

MR. WHITLEY said the point he had raised was not yet covered. The conversion of a part of a school into a higher grade school under the second part of the Bill was excluded. It would be desirable to leave out the limiting words "public elementary school."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR replied that that could not be done. The Government never contemplated that it should be in the power of the local authority to convert a primary voluntary school into a secondary school. That would be destroying its whole value as an elementary school.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the word 'school,' to insert the words 'and also for other educational purposes if the local education authority have no other suitable accommodation in providing schools, but not more often than three days a week.'"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question proposed "that those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

MR. BRYCE thought a hard and fast rule might prove rather hard and inconvenient in practice. In many cases more than three days a week could well be given, but as far as he could see, there was no means by which the local authority could call for more than that number of days. The purposes for which the schools would be wanted when not educationally employed were laudable and excellent, and all would desire to see the buildings put to the best possible purposes. But the words of the right hon. Gentleman seemed to be deficient in elasticity. What was wanted was a scheme under which it would be in the power of some impartial authority to say if it could not be shown that the buildings were wanted for denominational purposes, that the education authority could have them for more than three nights.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS thought it would be well for the Committee to accept the Amendment in the spirit in which the Prime Minister had moved it. As he understood it the right hon. Gentleman would not have the slightest objection to providing that the school-house should be available for educational purposes, if necessary, on more than three nights a week, unless it was reasonably required by the managers for other purposes.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that that matter would be open to arrangement; but he did not believe that there would be the smallest difficulty in having the schools for educational purposes six nights a week, unless there was some local reason to the contrary. What the Government desired to prevent was the managers taking advantage of their power over a school in the evening hours because they happened to have a quarrel with the local authority. The Amendment declared that the local authority had a right to demand the use of the school on three nights in the week, and all the rest, he was sure, might be left to arrangement between the parties.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said that was why he thought it would be wise to accept the Amendment now, reserving the right to move subsequently the extension he had suggested.

Question put and agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

(11.52.) Mr. A. K. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon) said the object of the Amendment he was about to move was to remove the ambiguity which at present existed as to the funds out of which the managers were to keep the buildings in repair. By some the words were understood to imply a personal liability on the part of the managers, and by others that the fund was to be provided *ad hoc.* The words he proposed would remove the ambiguity by enumerating a few specified sources of the kind to which the Clause was intended to apply, while the words "or other" would show that an exhaustive list had not been attempted. Another object of the Amendment was to meet the hostile and unwarranted limitation which some people would be ready to put upon the resources available for this purpose. Amendments already appeared on the Paper proposing to deprive the managers of the power to use endowments for the purpose of meeting the requirements of the local education authority. Thus to cripple the managers could only have the effect of rendering it impossible for them to comply with the local authority's requirements, with the result that the school would be broken up. For the most part, the trust deeds would fall under four heads. They provided that the income for endowments should be applied to the fabric of the school, to the support and maintenance of the school generally, to the provision of free education, books, etc., for a specified number of children, or to the payment of teachers' salaries. The exclusion of endowments from the resources available to the managers would be directly contrary to the first two of those articles of the deeds. He submitted that the only condition which ought to be placed upon the application of endowments was that they should be used for educational purposes in the parish or locality for which the trust was created; and that condition would be complied with by applying the income from endowments to the necessary repairs called for by the local authority.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 17, after the words 'out of,' to insert the words 'subscriptions, donations, income from endowment, or other.'"—(*Mr. A. K. Loyd.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Sir CHARLES DILKE pointed out that the Government had promised to bring in fresh proposals with regard to endowments, and, as the Amendment raised the question of endowments, it was necessary that the Committee should know what the Government were going to propose.

Mr. BRYCE agreed that the question was very important, and suggested that Progress should be reported.

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 29th October, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

WICK BURGH EXTENSION ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Norwich; Leicester; White Coppice; Diss; and, Arbroath; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Hartlepools; Reading; Suffolk; and, Hanwell; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Norwich; Leicester; Arbroath; Diss; and, White Coppice; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Edge Hill; St. Helens (two); Liverpool; Sheffield; and, Kirkdale; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: from Norwich; Leicester; Diss; White Coppice; and, Arbroath; to lie upon the Table.

VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Croydon: in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOCAL RECORDS COMMITTEE.

Copy presented, of Appendices to the Report of the Committee appointed to inquire as to the existing arrangements for the collection and custody of Local Records, and as to further measures which it may be advisable to take for the purpose [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.

Copy presented, of Return showing the Unclaimed Shares of all Prize Money, Slave and Pirate Bounties, Salvage Awards, Parliamentary Grants, War Gratuities, and other Monies distributed by the Admiralty from the 1st day of January, 1855, to the 31st day of March, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Civil Servants' Superannuation Commission.

Mr. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Committee for inquiring into the Civil Servants' Superannuation Act, promised some time ago, has yet been formed, and whether they will take evidence from the staff; will he state the terms of reference, and will the Report be published as a Parliamentary Paper.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The arrangements for constituting the Commission are not yet completed. I announced the terms of reference on 31st July last; they are as follows: "To inquire into the working of the system of superannuation embodied in the Superannuation Acts, and to report whether, without increasing the charge on public funds for non-effective services, any change in the system is desirable in the interests either of Civil Servants or the State." The question of what evidence should be taken must be left to the discretion of the Commissioners.

Indian Land Revenue—Default Statistics.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is now in a position to state the number of writs and warrants issued in each province in India against Land Revenue Defaulters during the year ending 31st March last, and the amount which it was thus sought to recover in each province.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) I have not yet received the Provincial Land Revenue Administration Reports dealing with the year 1901–2, but I am in communication with the Government of India on the subject referred to in the hon. Member's Question, and, if I find that I can supply the information for which he asks, I will let him know it.

India—Land under Cultivation.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India, in view of a statement contained in his Budget speech last year to the effect that the area of land under cultivation in India has increased from 194,000,000 acres in 1880 to 217,000,000 acres in 1900, will he say whether that land is now in the occupation of the people, or does it include any land which at one time was under cultivation and is now waste and unoccupied; and will he state approximately the area actually in occupation and under cultivation in each province of India.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) It is possible that some temporarily uncultivated land may have been included in the estimate which I quoted, though not enough to impair its general accuracy. In the surveyed tracts of the undermentioned provinces, the cropped area for 1900–1 is given as follows—

	(In thousands of acres.)
Madras	27,850
Bombay and Sindh . .	25,468
Bengal	62,098
United Provinces . . .	42,036
Punjab	31,770
Central Provinces . . .	16,210
Lower Burma and Assam .	12,444

Postmen—Dismissals; Wages.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): To ask the Postmaster General, what number of auxiliary and established postmen respectively have been prosecuted, and what number have been dismissed under suspicion in both classes since the 1st January, 1901; and what is the amount of weekly wages received by the men so dealt with in each class.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The following table shows the number of established and other postmen who were (1) dismissed; (2) prosecuted during the period from 1st January, 1901, to 30th September 1902—

	(1) Number dismissed for all causes.	(2) Number prosecuted.
Established Postmen	534	70
Auxiliary Postmen*	301	70
Assistant Postmen ...	55	7

* Including a few temporary postmen, casual postmen, etc.

The weekly wages of established postmen vary in London from 18s. to 34s., and elsewhere from 16s. to 30s. Assistant postmen are paid for six hours work at the rate of five-sixths of the town postmen's minimum (*e.g.* 15s. a week in London) with a proportionate decrease for shorter attendance. Auxiliaries are paid at the rate of 6d. an hour in London, and from 4d. to 6d. an hour in the provinces and Scotland and Ireland.

Clones Post Office.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): To ask the Postmaster General if he is aware that several years ago the post office in Clones was condemned as unsanitary and unsuitable for the work of the Department; will he explain the delay in building the new post office, and investigate the complaints of the employees as to the change in the hours they are required to be on duty.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The old insanitary office at Clones was given up in November last, and a good temporary office is in occupation pending the completion of the new permanent building, the plans for which have been approved. It is understood that the building will be begun shortly. Complaints recently received from the staff with regard to their hours of duty are being investigated.

Irish Travelling Post Offices—Risk Allowances.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that during the carrying out of the Tweedmouth Committee recommendations in 1897 the Department arrested the registered letter risk allowances from a number of officers attached to the travelling post offices in Ireland, and that the officers concerned have, after repeatedly petitioning, establish their claim to those allowances; and, having regard to the fact that authority was granted about eighteen months ago for their restoration, will he will explain the cause of delay in paying the arrears due since arrestment.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I am not aware that any of the officers referred to, whose claims to allowances have been established, have not received payment of arrears due to them; but I will have inquiry made into the matter, and acquaint the hon. Member with the result.

Russia and Afghanistan.

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will give the date of the communication from the Russian Government as to the establishment of relations between Russia and Afghanistan; and whether he will give the reference to any Parliamentary Paper which sets out the terms of the understanding by which Russia agrees to treat Afghanistan as outside the sphere of her influence.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne*). The date of the communication from the Russian Government is 6th February 1900. The Parliamentary Papers containing information as to the engagement of the Russian Government to consider Afghanistan outside their sphere of influence are: Central Asia, No. 2 (1873), pages 2 and 12; Russia No. (1874), page 9; Central Asia, No. 1 (1878), pages 5, 7, 68, 69, 105, and 164: Central Asia, No. 1 (1879), page 10; Central Asia, No. 1 (1884), pages 5 and 92; Central Asia, No. 2 (1885), pages 29, 194, and 195.

Education Bill—Definition of "Secular."

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): To ask Mr. Attorney General whether he intends to introduce into the eighteenth Clause of the Education Bill any definition of the word "secular;" and, if so, whether he will put his Amendment on the Notice Paper without delay.

(*Answered by Sir Robert Finlay.*) I do not think it convenient to discuss by way of Question and answer the subject of possible Amendments to a Clause not yet reached in a Bill now in Committee.

Elementary School Teachers' Annuity Accounts.

MR CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state when the Accounts of the Elementary School Teachers' Deferred Annuity Funds (England and Scotland) for the years ended 31st March, 1901 and 1902, together with the Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 95, of Session 1901), will be printed and circulated.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) In accordance with a suggestion by the Comptroller and Auditor General, these Accounts are now published as Appendices to his Annual Reports on the Appropriation Accounts of the Votes for Public Education for England and Scotland respectively. The Accounts for the year 1900–1901 will be found on pages 370-371 and 394-395 respectively of the Civil Services, etc., Appropriation Accounts for 1900-1901 (House of Commons Paper 35, of 1902); and those for 1901-02 will appear in the Appropriation Accounts for 1901–02, which will be issued in January or February next.

Clonmel Land Appeals.

MR. CONDON (Tipperary E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Chief Land Commissioners sat to hear appeals in Waterford in January last; and whether, contrary to practice, cases were heard there from the unions of Clonmel, Cashel, Clogheen, and Thurles, causing inconvenience and expense to the suitors which could have been avoided by hearing the cases in Clonmel; and whether he will suggest that in future appeals from those unions will be heard in Clonmel.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The question of holding the next sitting at Clonmel will be duly considered by the Commissioners when the list of appeals from these districts is being prepared.

Hard Labour Sentences—Disqualifications for Municipal Service.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether be is aware that Mr. P. J. Kelly, R.M., has stated in Court that he was not aware that a sentence of imprisonment with hard labour entails disqualification from service on public boards; and whether he can state if Mr. P. J. Kelly is one of the magistrates of whose legal knowledge the Lord Lieutenant is satisfied, as required by statute.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) This Question has been referred to Mr. Kelly, who emphatically denies having made use of the observation attributed to him. He was well aware of the disqualification prescribed by statute, but it was not until after the sentence imposing hard labour had been passed on the defendant in the case before the Court that attention was drawn, for the first time, by counsel for the defendant, to the fact that the latter was a district councillor. Mr. Kelly was not previously aware of this fact, and it was to this alone that he referred when he remarked that he saw no reason in the fact to alter his concurrence in the decision announced by the Chairman. The reply to the second part of the Question is in the affirmative.

Barrow Drainage Works.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he proposes introducing legislation next session giving effect to the recommendations contained in the Reports of the Barrow Drainage Commission, 1885, and the first Report of the Royal Commission on Public Works in Ireland, 1886, in favour of the drainage of the River Barrow.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I am not prepared to anticipate statements which are proper to the beginning and not to the end of a session.

Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork Co., Mid): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what facilities he proposes to give for the discussion of the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for South Louth for the Amendment of the Labourers (Ireland) Acts, and of the right hon. Gentleman's Amendments thereto.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) If all the Amendments I have put down are accepted, practically only one Clause remains. The Bill then would only require a very brief period for discussion. Evidently there cannot be time to discuss the Clause to which the Government is opposed.

Land Court Valuers and Sub-Commissioners.

MR. FLYNN (Cork Co., N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the statements made by Land Commissioner O'Brien, at Longford, in November, 1901, to the effect that the court valuers have not the same opportunity of forming a just opinion as to the fair rents of holdings as the sub-Commissioners have, and cannot take evidence as to cultivation, manuring, and general improvements; and whether, in view of these statements, the Government propose to abolish the right of appeal from the decisions of the sub-Commissioners except in regard to legal points.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) My attention has not been directed to the statements in question. I cannot indicate the detailed provisions of legislation to be introduced at a future date.

Closing of Irish Prisons.

MR. FLYNN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in reference to the five county prisons at Carrick-on-Shannon, Enniskillen, Mullingar, Omagh, and Wicklow, which have recently been closed, whether he can say to what use will the buildings be now applied; whose property are they now, and in whose custody will they remain; and will the Government consider the advisability of handing them over to the Agricultural and Technical Department, with a view to be utilised in the development of Irish industries.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The five prisons are being used as places of detention for prisoners awaiting trial at assizes and quarter sessions. So long as they continue to be used for public purposes the property in, and control over, the buildings remain vested in the General Prisons Board.

Lisburn Labourers' Cottages Scheme.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Local Government Board inspector visited, on the 16th and 17th August, all the sites comprised in the recent schemes passed by the Lisburn Rural Council for labourers' cottages; that he reported shortly afterwards to the Local Government Board; that his report has not yet been furnished to the District Council; and whether he will expedite the action of the Local Government Board in this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The result of this inquiry was communicated to the District Council on Wednesday last.

Rae Estate, Kerry.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will arrange that Mr. Rae, landlord of the Rae estate, Killorglin, County Kerry, shall be furnished with a detailed return of the receipts and the expenditure of the estate during the period it has been in the hands of present receiver.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I am informed that copies of the receiver's accounts will be furnished to Mr. Rae on payment of the usual fees for copying.

Historic Relics at Inishvickillane (Kerry).

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Irish Lights Board sent a steamer to Blasket Island, County Kerry, to take away some historic relics; and will he say at whose instance was this work done, where have the relics been deposited, and whether he will see that they are brought back again to their proper place.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I am informed that a lintel stone has been removed from the island of Inishvickillane by one of the steamers belonging to the Commissioners of Irish Lights. It is stated that the stone was presented by the owner of the island to Professor Mahaffy, of Trinity College, Dublin, and that it has been placed in the museum of the college. The Board of Public Works is in correspondence with Professor Mahaffy on the subject.

Phthisis in Cornwall Mines.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state the number of cases of miners' phthisis which have occurred within the area of the mining division of Cornwall for each year since, and including, the year 1895; and what number of deaths have occurred.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The figures asked for are not in my possession, and I doubt if they can be obtained. The latest figures of which I am aware, with regard to the mortality among Cornish miners from phthisis, are those published in 1897 by the Registrar General. On the basis of the census taken in 1891 these show that, if the mortality figure among occupied males generally from phthisis is taken at 100, that among Cornish miners would be 275. I would add that the health of the miners in Cornwall is at the present time the subject of a special inquiry on behalf of the Home Office.

Coal for the Navy—New Zealand Coal for the China Squadron.

MR. DAVID THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty to what extent New Zealand (Westport) coal is being used by the China Squadron, and whether its use is due to any deficiency in the supply obtainable from ordinary sources or to the lower price; whether the Admiralty have issued any Memorandum desiring that its value shall be made known generally; and if it is proposed to continue the use of Westport coal in the event of war.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) On account of its good quality and its comparative nearness to the China station, large quantities of New Zealand (Westport) coal are used by the China Squadron. It is not desirable in the interests of the public service to state what the arrangements of the Admiralty, as regards the supply of coal, would be in time of war

Remount Inquiry—Remuneration of Legal Assessor.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeenshire, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War, can he explain on what system the sum of £2,163 was paid to the learned Member of this House who sat as Assessor to the Court of Inquiry into the Remount Department; whether the same learned Member has held any other appointment on any other commission connected with South Africa; and, if so, what sum was paid to him for such service.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The War Office, acting on the request of the Commander-in-Chief, instructed the Treasury Solicitor to secure legal assistance for the members of the Court of Inquiry. The selection of the Assessor was made, and his remuneration determined according to the ordinary practice in analogous cases. The Assessor devoted his whole time to the proceedings of the Court, but of course had no share in the Report or in the decisions at which the Court arrived. Mr. Milvain was Chairman of the South African Deportations Committee, and received for his services a sum of £2,551 10s.

Sentences of Military Courts in Cape Colony.

MR. PIRIE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been directed to a Parliamentary Paper, recently issued at Cape Town, giving the names of 113 prisoners sentenced by military courts in Cape Colony; whether the Commission sent out by His Majesty's Government has recommended their immediate release; and, if so, whether they have yet been released; whether he is aware that all these prisoners were under sixteen years of age, and British subjects, and that three of them were girls; and will he state what were the offences of the three girls, and to what terms of imprisonment were they sentenced.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I have seen this Parliamentary Paper, but I am not aware of the action taken by the Cape Government. I have no information as to the ages of the prisoners in the Return. Two women are included, one of whom was given a year's imprisonment with hard labour for supplying liquor without a permit, and another, a coloured woman, was given the same sentence (six months of which were remitted) for being in possession of brandy. As to a person included in the list under the name of Sarah, who is apparently a Kaffir, it is not known whether the name in this case represents a male or female.

Archbishopric of Cyprus.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the Archbishopric of Cyprus has been vacant for two years, and that a successor to Monsignor Sophronius was elected eighteen months ago; what steps will be taken by His Majesty's Government to give effect to the votes of the clergy and laity of the Eastern Orthodox Church in Cyprus; and whether, in view of the inconvenience which is being caused to the Christian population of that island by the delay in confirming the election, he will communicate to the House the reasons for delaying the approval of the appointment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) The hon. Member is misinformed. No successor to Monsignor Sophronius was elected eighteen months ago, or has yet been elected. The election to which he refers was an election of general representatives to co-operate with the Holy Synod in the election of an archbishop.

Transvaal Mines—Mining Labour—Phthisis, &c.

MR. CAINE: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in view of the number of British miners who are looking to South Africa for employment, whether he will publish a summary of the regulations and laws now in force in the Transvaal and Orange States affecting working miners, including a statement of the intentions of the Government with regard to the future regulation of mining labour, especially with regard to the use of rock drills.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) A copy of the hon. Member's Question will be sent to the Governor, who will be asked to furnish a report on the subject.

MR. CAINE: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention has been drawn to the growing number of disputes between mine owners and working miners in the Rand, resulting in strikes on the part of the miners and, as in the case of the Village Main Reef, lockouts on the part of the mine owners; if he is aware that most of these disputes have reference to matters affecting the health and safety of the miners; and will he consider the desirability of creating a Board of Arbitration for the settlement of these disputes.

Mr. CAINE: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state the number of cases which have occurred of miners' phthisis, with the deaths resulting therefrom, from the re-opening of the mines after the war to some recent date; what number of these are Europeans, and what number native, and what has been the average number of European and native miners employed on the Rand during each month of the period covered.

Mr. CAINE: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention has been called to the discontent prevailing among British miners in the Rand in consequence of the attempt on the part of several mine managers to compel miners to take over and work three rock drills instead of two as heretofore; if he is aware that this attempt has resulted in a strike on the part of the miners where this change is being enforced, and that a deputation of Rand miners waited upon Lord Milner to ask him to constitute a Board of Arbitration, but without effect; and, in view of the death rate from miners' phthisis in Johannesburg, and the fact that miners return home to this country incapacitated by this disease, will he state what action the Transvaal Administration propose to take in the matter.

Mr. CAINE: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if it is the intention of the Governor of the Transvaal to appoint a commission to inquire into miners' phthisis; has such commission been yet appointed; if so, what is its composition; will it contain representatives of the working miners; and will he state the substance of the references for its consideration.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) I propose to answer the four Questions of the hon. Member together, as they are all connected with the same subject, and I need hardly say that I am fully alive to the importance of all matters affecting the health and safety of the miners. As I informed the hon. Member on the 21st instant, I am in communication with Lord Milner on the subject of the alleged prevalence of miner's phthisis, but at present I possess neither statistics nor the other information for which the hon. Member has asked. I will, however, address further inquiries to Lord Milner on these matters.

Sierra Leone Railways.

Mr. W. F. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercrombie): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if the public are being asked to tender for the construction of, and for the material and carriage of, the material required for the Highland Railway of Sierra Leone, or for the material and carriage of material required for the Freetown and Eastern District Railway of Sierra Leone, and the Secondee and Lagos Railways; and, if not, will he explain why this course has not been adopted.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) The public are not being, and will not be, asked to tender for the construction of any of the railways named, all of which are being, or have been, built by the Governments concerned on the Departmental System. The system has, after full consideration in each case, been considered perferable to the contract system. The principal reason is that, owing to the risks due to climate and other causes, against which a contractor would have to protect himself, the system adopted is preferable. The materials are obtained by competition among selected firms, a system which has been found to be better adapted than that of open competition to secure that high standard of quality which is essential in supplies sent to distant Colonies, where defects can only be remedied at great cost and inconvenience. The "carriage," by which I understand freight to be meant, is not put up to tender because there is only one British line running regularly to the West Coast of Africa.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

Imports of Live Stock into the Transvaal.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any tax is made on cattle entering the Transvaal; and, if so, will he say how much per head.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham, W.): All kinds of live stock are free on importation into the Transvaal.

Irregular Troops—Pension Grievances—Case of Mrs Mackenzie.

Sir JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that Mrs. J. R. Mackenzie, a widow residing at Maritzburg, Natal, who has had three sons serving in the British forces in South Africa, one of whom, a trooper in the 1st Imperial Light Horse, was killed on Wagon Hill, while a second serving in the Scottish Horse, died in hospital on the 22nd July last, from exposure and overwork during the war, and the third son, in the Natal Carabineers, was severely wounded on 5th February 1902, and has been in hospital ever since, has been informed that she can obtain no compensation for the loss she has suffered by their deaths, on the ground that they were not in the Imperial Army nor in the Natal Volunteer Corps; and, seeing that if the two dead sons had been in the Imperial Army compensation would have been awarded to her, and if they had been in the Natal Volunteers she would have been entitled to a pension of £52 per annum for each, and that she is in poor circumstances, can he arrange that special consideration shall be given to her case.

* The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the WAR OFFICE (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): No communication from Mrs Mackenzie has reached the War Office. The regulations however, do not admit of a grant to the mother of a soldier who dies, even if in action. Her case has been considered by the representative of the Patriotic Fund Commissioners in South Africa, who found that the extent of her means debarred her from any grant. I have no knowledge of the grants made by the Colony in the case of Natal Volunteers.

Civil Surgeons and War Honours.

Mr. SOAMES (Norfolk, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any decorations, emolument, or other reward will be bestowed upon the civil surgeons in Great Britain and Ireland who have been attached to the Royal Army Medical Corps throughout the whole duration of the South African war; and whether, in terminating the engagements of such surgeons, consideration will be given to the length of their services with the Royal Army Medical Corps.

* Lord STANLEY: A large number of honours has been given to civil surgeons serving in South Africa, but it is not proposed to bestow any such decoration or reward to the civil surgeons who have been employed at home during the war. As regards engagements, their termination is regulated by their agreements, and extensions are decided upon according to local conditions.

Height Standards for the Cavalry.

*Sir J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the maximum and minimum standard of height now laid down for recruits to be admitted into the Regular Cavalry.

* Lord STANLEY: The standards of height are as follow—

	Maximum		Minimum	
	Ft.	In.	Ft.	In.
Household Cavalry	6	1	5	11
Lancers. . .	5	9	5	6
Dragoons . .	5	8	5	5
Hussars . .	5	6	5	4

*Sir J. DICKSON-POYNDER: Is it not the fact that the standard laid down has been so low during the past year that many of the recruits admitted into the Cavalry, especially in Ireland, have been considered since to be unfit for the service?

* Lord STANLEY: No, Sir, I do not think that is the case.

Employment for Ex-Soldiers.

Major RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the possibility of employing reservists and time-expired men on fatigue and special duties, such as mess waiters, garrison police, officers' servants, orderlies, and canteen men.

* LORD STANLEY: The whole question of replacing soldiers by ex-soldiers, etc., in respect of the performance of these and similar duties has been under and is still the subject of very careful consideration, but my hon. and gallant friend is aware that any such proposal must add considerably to the Army Estimates.

Time-Expired Men.

MAJOR RASCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether time-expired men, as well as Reserves in A, B, C, D, may rejoin for short periods; and if married men with their wives will be on the strength or granted separation allowance.

* LORD STANLEY: Time-expired men can only rejoin by re-enlisting for three years, and must be under thirty years of age. The married men, who can engage only for one year, will be entitled to the privileges of the married roll, but their wives will draw separation allowance.

Cape Guardafui Lighthouse.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any decision has yet been arrived at in regard to the proposed establishment of a lighthouse on Cape Guardafui.

* THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): The answer is in the negative.

MR. WEIR: May I ask, seeing that this matter has been under consideration for some years, when some decision is likely to be arrived at?

* LORD CRANBORNE: The decision does not lie with the British Government entirely.

Penrhyn Quarry Dispute.

MR. DAVID THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether at any time during the two years over which the dispute at the Penrhyn Quarries has now extended, or prior to its commencement, either of the parties more immediately interested has directly made the application to the Department required to be made before the Board of Trade can exercise the power conditionally conferred upon it by sub-Section (*c*) of Clause 2 of the Conciliation Act, 1896, of appointing a person or persons to act as a conciliator or as a board of conciliation.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The answer is in the negative.

MR. DAVID THOMAS: Has neither party on any occasion made any approach to the Board of Trade in respect of the dispute?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir.

Hours of Railway Servants.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, seeing that, according to the Return just issued with reference to the hours of railway servants, it appears that upon three of the principal railways in this country 89 per cent. of the goods guards and brakesmen, and 85 per cent. of the engine-drivers and firemen were working during the month of December last for more than twelve hours at a time, he will use his good offices with these companies in order to obtain a reduction of these hours.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The hon. and gallant Member's Question would seem to imply that the percentages to which he refers represent the number of railway servants working continuously throughout the month for more than twelve hours at a time. What the percentages really indicate is the number of railway servants who on one or more occasions during the month worked for more than twelve hours at a time. The percentage of days exceeding twelve hours, which is also given in the Return, is a better guide to the condition of affairs than the percentage of servants employed. I have communicated with various railway companies with the object suggested in the Question, and I also propose to call for a similar Return of hours for next December.

Cottars in the Island of Lewis.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he can furnish a Comparative Statement showing the number of cottars in the Island of Lewis at the time of the passing of The Crofters Act, 1886, and the number at the present time.

The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire): A detailed Report on the social condition of the people of Lewis in 1901 as compared with twenty years ago, prepared by the Crofters Commission, was laid on the Table of the House last week, and will be circulated so soon as the printing is completed. The hon. Member will find information on the subject of his question in that Report, to which I hope he will allow me to refer him.

Crofts in Ross-shire and the Island of Lewis.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, in view of the fact that the Deer Forest Commission state, at Page X. of their Report, dated 10th March, 1895, that any scheme that would result in affording cottars the opportunity of obtaining crofts such as presently exist would operate a substantial relief both to the cottars themselves and to the neighbouring crofters, he will take steps to meet the requirements in this direction of the cottars in the Island of Lewis and on the western mainland of Ross-shire.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I beg to refer the hon. Member to the answer given to a similar Question asked by him on the 23rd instant,† to which, for the present, I am unable to add anything.

Mr. WEIR: May I ask whether the Secretary for Scotland has any intention of visiting the Island of Lewis to see for himself the serious state of affairs there?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the Question.

Education Bill—Denominational School Teachers' Appointments.

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, under Clause 8, sub-Section (1) (*c*), the local education authority will have the right to call for evidence of the comparative educational fitness of candidates for the post of head teacher in a denominational school other than the candidate recommended by the managers.

The SECRETARY of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Sir William Anson, Oxford University): The answer to the hon. Member's Question is in the negative.

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS: May I ask if an answer in a contrary sense was not given by the Attorney General?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! It is not in order to refer to an answer previously given.

Suggested Government Instructions to Resident Magistrates.

Mr. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for South Down, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if any resident magistrates who have adjudicated in cases under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act have had any interview with any Dublin Castle official or officials during the past three months, or have been in written communication with any such official or officials; and whether he has any objection to stating the nature of such interviews or communications.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): I have no doubt that communications dealing with claims for travelling expenses and so forth have passed between persons holding official positions in Dublin Castle and resident magistrates engaged in the hearing of cases under the Act mentioned during the past three months; but such communications had no reference to the discharge by these magistrates of their judicial duties. On this subject I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to the Question addressed to me on Monday last by my hon. friend the Member for North Fermanagh.†

Mr. TULLY: Is there a log book kept at Dublin Castle showing the movements of the officials?

(No answer was returned.)

---

† See page 613.

† See page 818.

Swords Borough School—Case of Michael Keegan.

MR. MACARTNEY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, (1) whether his attention has been called to the case of Michael Keegan, who recently successfully competed for a borough school scholarship at Swords; and that, though first in order of merit, he has been disqualified by the examiners; (2) will he state whether the alleged ground of disqualification existed in the case of previous holders of scholarships; (3) whether the action of the examiners is in accordance with precedent; (4) to what denominations Michael Keegan and the two examiners belonged respectively; and (5) whether the matter has been referred to the Board of National Education.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are correctly stated in the first part of the Question. I have no information on the second and third inquiries. The lad Keegan is a Protestant and the examiners are Roman Catholics. The objection to the decision of the examiners has been referred to the Commissioners of National Education who have informed the examiners that in their judgment Keegan was a qualified candidate.

Irish Railway Facilities.

MR. TULLY: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Cork I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the complaints made by the merchants and traders of the district of the traffic arrangements of the Kanturk and Newmarket Railway as managed by the Great Southern and Western Railway Company; and, seeing that the taxpayers of the district are liable for a perpetual guarantee for the maintenance of the line, will the Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department take steps to secure adequate railway facilities for this district.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Department has received a complaint in regard to the train service between Newmarket, Cork, and Waterford, and is making inquiry into the matter.

Treatment of Crimes Act Prisoners.

MR. TULLY: On behalf of the hon. Member for the Ossory Division of Queen's Co., I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, (1) whether the hon. Members for Birr Division, King's Co., Messrs. Wm. Lowry, D.C., M. Hogan, D.C., and Michael Glennon, prisoners in Tullamore Gaol, undergoing terms of imprisonment under The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, are obliged to take exercise in the ring amongst the ordinary prisoners; and (2) whether the hon. Member for Tullamore Division, also in the same prison, and who has been transferred to the infirmary by order of the prison surgeon, is denied the use of a knife and fork.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first inquiry is in the negative. The prisoners are in the "star" Class, and accordingly are not exercised with habitual criminals or prisoners of corrupt habits. In respect to the second inquiry, convicted prisoners are not allowed the use of knives and forks. Food requiring to be cut up is cut before being served, and a spoon is supplied. The hon. Member for the Tullamore Division recently informed one of the Members of the Prisons Board who visited the prison that he was receiving every kindness and attention and had no complaint to make.

MR. TULLY: When I was a hard labour prisoner in Tullamore I exercised alone.

Labourers (Ireland) Act—Skibbereen Applications.

MR. TULLY: On behalf of the hon. Member for the South Division of County Cork I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Rural District Council of Skibbereen have made four applications to the Commissioners of Public Works for a loan under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts; and gave each time satisfactory assurances that the loan would be paid in half-yearly instalments; and will steps be taken to grant this loan to enable this scheme to be carried into effect.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners required the District Council to undertake that the half-yearly payments in respect not only of the new loan, but also of existing loans, would be punctually made. The Council gave the undertaking as regards the proposed new loan, but refused to give it as to existing loans. The application cannot, therefore, be proceeded with.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. TULLY.

MR. TULLY: By way of personal explanation may I be permitted to say that the only right I claim in asking these Questions is the right of conquest won in single combat here?

* MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member has acted most improperly. It is a well-known rule of this House that Questions are not to be asked on behalf of another Member except at his request and on his behalf, and what the hon. Member has done is quite contrary to the usual practice and courtesies of this House.

MR. TULLY: May I respectfully say I thought that the spoils remained to the conqueror.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury what will be the business for the rest of the week.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I propose to take the Education Bill at all the sittings during the remainder of the week.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8—

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 17, after the words 'out of,' to insert the words 'subscriptions, donations, income from endowment, or other.'"—(*Mr. A. K. Loyd.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

(2.25.) LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said he had an Amendment further down on the Paper with regard to the question of endowment, and the hon. Member for the Abingdon Division, when he moved his Amendment at a very late hour on the previous night, intimated quite accurately that it raised the same point only in a different manner. Now he was anxious to insert a proviso to make it perfectly clear that these endowments, which were very numerous in connection with elementary schools, should not be appropriated by the managers of the schools and carried to the buildings and repairs fund, but that they should be used for educational purposes, and go in diminution of the rates and burdens thrown on the general body of taxpayers. This matter was very important in itself, and it became doubly important by reason of the decision which the Committee unfortunately came to on the previous evening with regard to paying a rent for the teacher's dwelling-house, because, in consequence, a large county authority would, in future, have to hand over a very considerable sum from the rates to the managers in relief of the burden they would otherwise have to bear themselves in regard to the upkeep of their buildings. It was impossible, of course, to state exactly what the sum would amount to, but one might gather from the concessions made by the Government to the friends of the so-called denominational and voluntary schools, coupled with the present Amendment, that there was a great desire, on the Ministerial side of the House, to constitute, out of the rentals paid by the local authorities, an endowment fund which would very largely, and, in some cases, almost entirely, relieve the supporters of these denominational schools from the necessity of finding money by voluntary subscriptions, for the maintenance of the fabric. It might appear the most just and rational thing in the world that, if there were endowments attached to a denominational school, they should necessarily go in support of the fabric of the school. But it was not enough merely to state a general proposition of that kind. They had to ask themselves how, in a great number of cases the endowments came to belong to the Church of England. We unhesitatingly say that, if they examined the records of the Charity Commissioners, they would find that, in a vast number of instances, the denominations, and more especially the Church of England, had become possessed of funds which the pious founders never intended them to have. In the early days of the history of these endowments, before the Charity Commission came into existence, it was an exceedingly common thing for the Court of Chancery to assume that silence on the point in the trust deed implied an intention on the part of the founder that the charity should go to the Established Church. In the century before last enormous charities were handed over to the Church of England, although the scheme was never stamped with any denominational desire at all. And even when the Charity Commission came into existence the same process continued, and there had been numerous cases in which endowments given for purposes which had ceased to exist, and which were in no way connected with education, were handed over in support of the National school. If the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Abingdon Division were adopted in all these cases in which the Church of England was enabled to take possession of the endowment, simply because at the time it owned the only school in the parish, it would be enabled to appropriate it in aid of the denominational side of school management. Looking at the broad aspect of many of these educational endowments which dated from a very remote period, they said that there were among them large funds which, from time to time, had been found to have no use at all under the original trust deeds—funds larger than any purely local funds. There was, for instance, the case of Betton's Charity, from which almost all the Church schools in the south and west of England received a small sum every year. In passing, he might observe that, in his opinion, its value was frittered away by this method of distribution. Betton was an excellent person who left a large sum for the rescue of people, especially children, who had been captured by Algerine pirates in the days when those pirates devastated the English and Irish Channels. They were not graced, he believed, at that time with the presence of the Irish Members of the House, but he was sure they would endorse his statement that the Roman Catholic inhabitants of Ireland suffered quite as much as other people from the depredations of these pirates. The fund was left for the rescue of these children equally with those of the children of Anglicans and Nonconformists. After a time, of course, the pirates disappeared, and the charity became useless, and the fund was devoted to education, and mainly distributed among Church of England schools. Why, in such a case, should funds which were never left to the Church of England be used for anything except for the benefit of the people of the district generally? He might mention a more extreme case as showing the absurdity of devoting these endowments to Church of England schools, which, after all, would be the principal beneficiaries under the Bill if it were amended as suggested by the hon. Member for the Abingdon Division. There was the famous old lady who figured in the early records of the Charity Commission, as, animated by a splendid spirit of piety, leaving a considerable sum to buy wood in order to burn heretics—Anglicans and Nonconformists, no doubt. He was informed that even that charity had somehow or other been diverted into the ever-gaping coffers of the Church of England schools. He repeated that a very large proportion of these endowments came from sources which were in no way whatever denominational, and therefore the ratepayers of the country, and not any particular denomination—Church of England or Non conformist, or Roman Catholic—ought to become the beneficiary of the charity. He sincerely hoped that after the great concession yesterday of the rental of the schoolmasters' dwellings the Government would not make any additional concession by accepting this Amendment, but that, on the contrary, if the Bill were not quite clear on the point, they would at the proper time accept an Amendment in a contrary sense, so as to make it certain that the ratepayers of our towns and country districts should reap the advantage of these funds which were left by the wisdom of our ancestors for the benefit, not of any particular denomination but of the people at large.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said he had listened with great interest to the erudite speech of the noble Lord, which recalled to their memories, or rather, he should say, gave them information on the subject with which, he confessed, he personally was very imperfectly acquainted; but he did not really think that the speech had much bearing on the Amendment. The Government held that they must deal in a separate Clause with the whole subject of endowments. He did not think that this difficult and complicated subject could be summarily disposed of either by the Amendment of his hon. friend or by the Amendment of the noble Lord, which came lower down on the Paper. He would, of course, on behalf of the Government, absolutely refuse to accept the noble Lord's Amendment which, if carried, would as he understood it prevent any endowments now used for voluntary schools from being continued to be used for that purpose. That was a quite inadmissible proposition. On the other hand, he thought that if his hon. friend's words were accepted they might lead to the erroneous conclusion that all the endowments now used for voluntary schools were to be transferred to the party concerned in their future maintenance, which would be represented by the managers, in other words, that all the endowments now used for the schools should be at the disposal of the managers for that school, and in relief of the obligations of the managers. That would be going too far on the other side. Speaking generally, he thought the equitable plan would be that where an endowment was left for what might be generally called, in an untechnical sense, the maintenance and upkeep of the school, that should be divided between the education authority and the managers, and that, so far as it went to the managers, it should, of course, go in relief of the obligations of the managers under the Bill. On the other hand, where it went to the local authority it should go in relief of the ratepapers of the parish. The Government were clearly of opinion that it would never do to use these funds to diminish the general burden of the rates under the local education authority. It was, he would not say always, a parochial charity, but at all events a charity restricted in its area, and they did not propose that its benefits should go beyond that area. That portion, therefore, which would go to the education authority would be properly used for the diminution of the education rate in the area for the benefit of which it was originally left. He was not at all disturbed in his view that this was an equitable plan by the noble Lord's historical proof that the voluntary schools, and the Church schools in particular, had absorbed in the course of centuries some endowments which were originally devoted to purposes probably now entirely obsolete. The general policy he recommended the House to adopt could not be dealt with in this Clause. As regarded the Amendment to the Clause which his hon. friend had moved, he thought it would be misleading to insert the words proposed. He believed they would be interpreted as the noble Lord himself had interpreted them, as meaning that every endowment now used for aiding voluntary education in a parish should go entirely to the managers of the voluntary school in that parish. That, he thought, was going too far. Though he did not believe that the words necessarily carried that interpretation, he thought they would mislead hasty readers of the Bill. He would suggest, therefore, that the words should not be inserted. As to the question of personal liability, it was distinctly understood that there was no personal liability on the part of the managers. They could only use the funds at their disposal. They were not under any personal or individual obligation to find funds from their own resources, if other resources should fail them. He hoped he had made quite clear what the Government were aiming at. Their policy followed a middle course between two extremes. It could only be dealt with in a separate section, and he trusted the Committee would wait until that section was before them before discussing the matter in detail.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said he would like to point out that Clause 13, sub-Section 2, provided that all receipts in respect of any school maintained by a local education authority, including the annual Parliamentary grant, but excluding sums specially applicable for purposes for which provision was to be made by the managers, should be paid to that authority. The President of the Local Government Board, when in charge of the Bill, referring to the words "all receipts in respect of any school," said that every farthing of income derived from endowments would pass beyond the managers and go into the coffers of the County Council. He would like to know whether the Prime Minister authorised that statement or approved of it now. It was not creditable to the House that they should be working their way through this complicated Clause dealing with trust deeds and endowments without having a single syllable of information as to the number and character of them, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would lay before them full information as to their extent and character, and accelerate the laying of the trust deeds on the Table.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said he did not think his hon. friend, in whose absence and at whose request he had taken charge of the Amendment, would desire to press it after the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House. But he would like to ask the Attorney General if he were satisfied that the words "provided by them" allowed the managers to make use of any moneys which might eventually come into their possession, such as endowments, rents, donations, or subscriptions. If the hon. and learned Gentleman could give him that assurance, he thought he might ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said he thought it was quite clear that these words would enable the managers to defray the cost of repairs or improvements out of any funds which might be at their disposal from whatever source.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON thought it would be difficult to reconcile that with the words of the sub-Section to which he had referred.

* SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said it was quite clear Clause 13 did not meet the point, but as the Prime Minister had promised a new scheme, they could hardly discuss the matter now. He wished, however, to utter one word of protest on the part of parishes which had very large endowments. It would not be fair to the parishes or groups of parishes for which these endowments had been provided that the endowments should become purely national or county gifts. These funds were given before there was any public assistance to education, and they were the gifts of the patriotic inhabitants who desired to benefit a parish or group of parishes. To ensure that they were not lost to that parish or group of parishes, an important change in the Bill was required, and when it was submitted they could discuss it.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said they were not proposing to discuss the whole question, but there could be no impropriety in calling attention at that stage to the fact that this was one of the most important questions in the Bill. There were a great many endowments, many of which had gone into the hands of the secondary schools, and they had been misapplied in this sense, that they had not given any greater benefit to the parish than they would have received without it, because the money had been appropriated to the relief of the wealthier inhabitants of that liability they would otherwise have been under for rates or voluntary subscriptions, and the poor for whose benefit the charities were really left had not been helped at all. He asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he intended, on behalf of the Government, to lay before the Committee a Clause.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

Mr. BRYCE said he thought he might assent, subject to certain qualifications, to the proposition that these endowments should be applied, not to the relief of the county ratepayers, but the local ratepayers. But he took exception to the contention that the managers were proper objects for the benefit of these charitable funds. He repeated that these charities were given for the education of the people, and they ought not to be appropriated in order to relieve the managers of their obligation, either in a personal capacity or as representing a body of the subscribers, to maintain the school. They were not given to relieve them of obligations which would otherwise have fallen upon them. He desired at the present moment to enter a *caveat* against any scheme which would, in defiance of what he thought was the policy of the law, in defiance of the intention of the pious founders, and in defiance of the bargain suggested by this Bill, apply those charity funds to the relief of the pockets of those who ought to pay.

*(3.0.) Mr. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge) said the question of the endowments was a very difficult one, because they had been left under different circumstances and for different reasons. There were some endowments which had been left for education in connection with a particular denomination. In dealing with these it seemed to him that they should properly be given to the managers, because there was no doubt about the intention of the founders. There was another class of endowments which had been left for the benefit of the education of the poor generally in the parish. There he thought they were left for education simply, and for that reason he did not think they should go to the managers. They ought to go to the local authority for the parish in some such way as that indicated by the First Lord. Then there was a third class which had been left for a particular purpose, but which, being no longer required for that purpose, had been diverted by the Charity Commissioners to a particular local elementary school. Since the passing of the Endowed Schools Acts and the Elementary Education Act of 1870, it had been the custom of the Charity Commissioners in nearly all cases to make such diversion to secondary education. Roughly speaking, there were very few such cases since 1869 or 1870. The suggestion he would make was that some body, such as the Board of Education or the Charity Commissioners, probably the Board of Education, should have power to go into every single endowment in order to ascertain the purpose for which it was originally left, and how it had since been applied, and to decide whether it should be paid over to the managers in future or to the county authority for the maintenance of a school in that particular parish. Unless they did that he did not see how they would arrive at any fair or satisfactory solution of the case. He could not agree with the right hon. Gentleman opposite that the endowments were being misapplied. When they were left the State did not supply education at all, and unless these endowments had been left there would have been no school for the people.

Mr. BRYCE said he was speaking from the experience he had thirty-five years ago when he was Assistant-Commissioner examining into the condition of those endowed schools. What he then found was—he did not say misapplication in the sense that there was anything criminal—that there were a great many rural parishes in which there were these old endowed schools. Where there was one of these parishes, the local people, the local magnates, who would otherwise have subscribed to establish a National, or perhaps a British school were relieved of the necessity of subscribing. Therefore they were able to be relieved of burdens which their neighbours in the adjoining parishes were bearing.

Mr. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said that very often a rich man instead of giving an annual subscription had capitalised his subscription by way of an endowment. Surely it was perfectly fair in that case that the interest of the endowment should go for the benefit, either of the subscribers or ratepayers as the case might be. He did not think there was very much difference between Members of the Committee on this question. He made this suggestion, because he felt that it was a matter that must be dealt with later on when the First Lord submitted his proposal.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said there were two questions raised here, firstly, what endowments were to be paid to the local authority, and secondly, what use was to be made by the local authority of the money after it had been paid over. The first question was already decided by sub-Section 2 of Clause 13, and they ought not to go back upon that provision. On the second point he thought they were all agreed. When the endowment had been paid to the local authority, they should be paid out by the local authority of the particular parish for the use of which the endowment was given. The Government would not be dealing fairly if they proposed another Clause to go back on the provision made in sub-Section 2 of Clause 13.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: May I venture to suggest to the Committee that we ought not now to discuss this? I stated that I should indicate the scheme of the Government, but if any endeavour to meet the mind of the Committee on a subject like this is to be followed by a long discussion, not on the Amendment but on a matter not absolutely germane to the Amendment, I shall be obliged to cut off the information I give to the House to limits which I think would be convenient to the House.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) said that formerly there had been an unsatisfactory system of dealing with disputed points in regard to endowments, that, namely, of bringing them up for decision by a more or less Party vote after twelve o'clock in a jaded House. He hoped the First Lord would make provision in the new scheme which would obviate the injustice which had occasionally happened under the existing practice.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) moved to leave out "them" and insert "foundation managers" in line 18 of Clause 8. The hon. Member on the other side appeared to be afraid that the words "provided by them" would put some liability on the managers as individuals. He certainly took the same view on reading the words "provided by them." He understood the First Lord now to say that that was not so, and that they would have, and could have, no financial responsibility themselves. He moved this Amendment simply to protect the two elected managers against any possible financial liability which it would be unjust to place on their shoulders. The First Lord's Amendment so far met the difficulty, but he wanted to know what would happen in this case. Suppose that the four foundation managers and the two elected managers acting together gave orders for the enlargement of a school at a cost of £500, they employed a contractor, and the work was done before they had raised subscriptions for the purpose; suppose further that they failed to raise the sum by subscriptions, and the contractors sued the managers, was it not a fact that the two elected managers would have to share the responsibility for the liability incurred? That was a danger which he wished to avoid, so that if poor men were elected managers they would have no possible burden resting on their shoulders.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 18, to leave out the word 'them,' and insert the words 'foundation managers.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'them' stand part of the Clause."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Of course the question of personal liability to the builder must in every case depend on the terms of the contract. There are many cases in which a committee is formed for a declared purpose. They might be considered to have pledged their personal liability, and to have taken the chance of getting the funds by subscription or elsewhere to defray it. I would suggest to the hon. Gentleman that it would not be reasonable to put in "foundation managers," because the intention is that the managers should execute the repairs out of funds provided by them for the purpose as a whole.

MR. WHITLEY said the explanation was not entirely satisfactory. It would be possible for the four foundation managers to enter into a contract for which the whole six would be liable, and in that way liability would be cast on the shoulders of the two elected members. That would be a serious thing for a poor man acting as one of the elected managers.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) objected to the introduction of the words proposed by the Amendment on the ground that he desired the managers here and everywhere to act as a whole. The obligation to keep the school in repair was placed on the whole of the managers, and he believed it was the intention of the Government that the two public managers should have as much voice in the matter as the four foundation managers.

MR. WHITLEY asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

The Amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

* MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough) moved to insert after "them" in line 18 of Clause 8 the words "which shall average not less than seven shillings per pupil in average attendance per annum." His object in moving the Amendment was to ensure that the managers would keep the schools in a proper state of repair and in a sanitary condition. They would be told that the question of the state of the schools could be controlled by the local education authority, who could require that the schools should be maintained in an efficient and sanitary condition, and that if the buildings were not so maintained the managers could be made to put their schools into a proper state of repair and sanitation by the Board of Education. At the present time the Board of Education possessed these powers, yet it was common knowledge that in the rural districts the instructions of the Board of Education were frequently disregarded, and the schools were often in a very unsatisfactory condition. It was to safeguard the interests of the people that he proposed the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not press his Amendment.

MR. LEVY said he certainly would.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would express no comment on the announcement of the intentions of the hon. Gentleman except to say that it was obviously absurd to lay down that in every school—whatever its circumstances, whether it was large or small, new or old, whether it belonged to the State or not—the managers must spend the same amount per child in average attendance.

MR. LEVY said he had no special fascination for the sum of 7s. Let the Prime Minister fix a minimum of 5s. if he liked, but his argument was that there should be a minimum sum below which the managers should not be allowed to go.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he could not see how anything could be gained in enforcing the managers to spend money if it was not required.

MR. CHARLES MORLEY (Brecknock) pointed out that there appeared to be some misapprehension in the mind of the right hon. Gentleman, for there was nothing in the Amendment to compel managers to spend not less than 7s. per pupil. The Amendment merely enforced the provision, and not the expenditure, of the money.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that that made it almost worse. Was the hon. Gentleman by the greatest effort of imagination to put himself into the position of insisting that the managers were to spend at the rate of 7s. per child per annum, whether it was wanted or not?

DR. MACNAMARA said he quite agreed with the First Lord of the Treasury that such a proposition would be impracticable. But, on the other hand, it was essential that the Government should see that the provisions of Clause 18 were carried out. He did not think that the proposal that the managers were to keep the buildings in a proper state of repair and sanitation was likely to be carried out. As a matter of fact, the money spent on repairs in many schools was entirely inadequate, as was shown by the return giving the particulars of such money spent on every school in the kingdom. In one school, with an average attendance of fifty children, the total amount of money spent on fuel, light, cleaning, rent, and taxes, etc., was 1s. 6d. per child; and when they took that off the contribution there was nothing left for repairs. And that was not an old school. The same argument applied to many schools in the country of which he could give details. A good standard had been set up in the Code recently issued in regard to sanitation rules. And, by the way, he would like to know how, for some mysterious reason, these rules had been dropped out of this year's Code. He suggested that the Government should undertake that the moment this Bill became law, the Board of Education should send out as a matter of information to the local education authorities throughout the country, a memorandum as to what they considered to be a reasonable standard of sanitation, cleansing, lighting, fuel, etc.

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said that the demand of the hon. Gentleman was a reasonable one and he would undertake that it would be satisfied.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said that the point of his right hon. friend had not been met. There could be no doubt that a large number of local authorities would insist on repairs to the school premises being carried out, and that the managers would say that they had no funds to do so. It would therefore take years to carry them out. He thought there was substance in the Amendment, and that if something were not done to compel the managers to provide the funds for repairs these would have to be carried out by the local education authority.

(3.30.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said it was very desirable that there should be some guarantee that the repairs would be carried out by the managers. A large number of the schools were not at present in proper repair; and, therefore, he thought they were justified in regarding, with some amount of suspicion, the mere words which declare that the schools should be kept in repair. He was not quite sure, however, whether his hon. friend's Amendment would meet the difficulty. The great difficulty was to know exactly what was meant by the word "repairs." On the face of it, the word seemed very simple; but there had been such litigation over it, that he was not quite sure it was clear what responsibility would be cast on the managers. It would be better to strengthen the Bill in the direction of making it clear what "repairs" would mean, rather than have the guarantee which was proposed. Would any part of the duty of keeping the building in good order be cast on the local authority? Would painting or papering for instance? That was the direction in which they should proceed; but the point could be better raised on a subsequent Amendment.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he agreed that the matter could be more conveniently discussed on a later Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, E.) in moving an Amendment to provide that the managers should insure the school buildings against fire, said the buildings might very easily be burned; and at present the managers in many cases neglected to insure them. Unless the Amendment were accepted, a very heavy liability might be thrown on many rural parishes. If a school which was not insured was burned down, the local authority would have to provide a new school, almost entirely at the expense of the persons living in the parish. The Bill was being discussed almost solely from the point of view of the theologian and the educationalist; and the heavy burden which would be placed on the local taxpayers was forgotten. The Bill should be considered not only from the standpoint of the large towns, where a man only paid rates on his house, but also from the standpoint of the rural districts where a man paid rates on his entire income. If a school were burned down in a small parish, it might result in an excessively heavy rate being imposed on the ratepayers.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 18, after the word 'then,' to insert the words 'insure against fire and.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not press his Amendment. It rested with the managers to insure the schools; and they could not impose on them by Act of Parliament an obligation to do that which related to their own business. If the managers desired the voluntary schools to be kept up then they would insure them against fire. If they did not insure schools, and they were burned down, the result would be that they would be succeeded by provided schools. That might be a good or a bad thing; but surely it was a little childish to suggest that managers should be compelled, by Act of Parliament, to do that which was entirely within their own province.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he wished to know if the cost of the insurance would fall on the rater. If it did, it would be a heavy burden. If the managers did not insure, would the local authority be saddled with the expense. That was the important point. As far as he was concerned, he was not anxious that the non-provided schools should be insured, because if they were not, they would, in the event of being burned down, be replaced by provided schools. What he wished to know was, would the education authority be expected to insure the non-provided schools?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that people did not usually insure buildings not belonging to them.

Question put and negatived.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said he desired to move an Amendment providing that the managers should discharge all liabilities incurred in connection with the school existing at the passing of the Act. At present a very large number of denominational schools were in debt; and that was a fact which would have to be faced in connection with the passing of the Bill. In August last the First Lord of the Treasury informed him that the local authority would have nothing to do with any such liabilities, and he now moved his Amendment in order that words might be incorporated in the Bill which would make that perfectly clear. He would put a concrete question to the Attorney General. If the local authority was not to be responsible for these liabilities after the passing of the Bill who would be responsible for them? Further, he wished to know if the additional managers to be elected would be responsible with the existing managers? He thought the Amendment should be accepted in order to avoid friction. There was no doubt in the mind of the Government about the matter; why, therefore, should it not be made plain in the Bill? Again, if the Attorney General would refer to Section 1 of the second schedule, he would see that the liabilities of the school attendance committees were to be transferred to the County Councils. He wished to know how that would affect the existing law, which laid down that the expenses of the attendance committees should be met by the guardians.

* THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see what bearing that has on the hon. Member's Amendment, which deals with the liabilities of managers.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS said that the point he wished to make was that the Government should make it clear in the Bill that the local authority would not be responsible for existing liabilities.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 18, after the word 'them,' to insert the words 'discharge all liabilities incurred in connection with the school existing at the passing of the Act.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the Amendment of the hon. Member was based on a misapprehension. The hon. Member appeared to think that the local education authority took over the school building and by so doing stood in the place of the school managers, taking over all the assets and becoming responsible for all expenditure. That was not so. The local education authority was only bound to maintain the school. The debts incurred by managers in the past would have to be discharged by the managers who took their place. The hon. Member asked who would pay their debts if the managers did not. He (Sir William Anson) might as well ask who would pay his own personal debts if he did not pay them.

He could only say he did not know. He only knew that the local education authority would not relieve the managers of their liabilities.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON did not think the hon. Gentleman had seen the important part of this Amendment. As he understood the Amendment, it sought to ensure that they should begin the new condition of things with a clean slate; that in return for the privileges which were to be given to the managers there should be handed over to the State a school with a mortgage on it, but a free school; that the managers should provide it, and ought to provide it, free of charge. A similar condition had, he believed, been insisted on by the Education Department itself in dealing with building grants. When building grants were given, the fundamental condition was that the ownership of the land was to be provided by trust deed. He had often asked for those deeds, but had never succeeded in getting them; but he believed that when they did see them they would find that those deeds provided that the buildings should be absolutely unencumbered. This Amendment practically suggested the same thing with regard to the schools.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT pointed out that if there was a mortgage over the school the mortgagee might foreclose, and when he took possession of the school what would be the position? Or supposing the gentleman who owned the school had an execution put in, whether in secular or religious hours, what would be the position? It would be a very inconvenient thing to have a man in possession.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Under those circumstances they would cease to be non-provided schools, if their proceedings are interrupted by the action of the managers.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said the managers ought not to be placed in a position of that kind. They desired to have the schools placed in a position that was quite clear, so that the local education authority might feel secure. If the parties who were the proprietors of the school could call upon the local education authority to carry on the education in the school, it was necessary that the local education authority should have some security.

MR. PYM (Bedford) said he thought the object of this Amendment was sufficiently indicated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen when he used the words "handed over." These schools were not provided for the local authority, they were lent to the local authority. The result was that, if these schools were broken up because they were not maintained by the managers who represented the trustees, then the county would have to provide schools in their place. It was absurd to talk of going into the question of the financial condition of these schools, which did not belong to the county. Every argument of the Opposition all through the Bill had been based upon the assumption that these schools belonged to the county, every Amendment had been made with the object of placing the local authorities in a position to deal with these schools as they pleased, and they could not do it. The Government were indebted to the Church for the saving of a large expense, and in return for that they were obliged to make certain conditions.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R. Morley) understood from the speech just previously made that the County Councils would have nothing to do with any of the financial arrangements of the schools. Supposing the opposite point were taken, and instead of having any financial control the County Councils had been so careful as to have no control whatever. If the school got a balance of a grant left over, would that go into the public exchequer of the county or to the managers of the school? He only desired to put the question.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That Question does not, I think, arise on this Amendment.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked, supposing there was a sum of money due from the old managers, whether that liability would, as he assumed it must, be transferred to the new school managers under this Bill. If it was a liability incurred purely on account of the trust, and that liability was transferred to the new trustees, he would like to know could any one distrain on the school assets—on the furniture, books, or apparatus of the school—for the purpose of discharging the liability incurred in connection with the trust itself.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The law would remain as it is. You cannot seize one man's property for the debts of another.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE pointed out that this was a trust liability; the liability could not remain where it was. The creditor surely could follow the trust assets.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he did not propose to follow the hon. and learned Gentleman into these abstruse questions, which had nothing to do with the Amendment.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE contended that if the liability incurred was in connection with the trust, or if it was in connection with the school—it was the same thing—the creditor could follow the books, furniture and apparatus if the money was not paid. What he desired to know was, would he be able to do so in the future, Would he be able to distrain for a liability incurred before the passing of this Bill, because if that were so this Amendment certainly ought to be adopted.

(3.58.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 113; Noes, 197. (Division List No. 434).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hon John (Montrose
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth.
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Herbert Roberts and
Mr. Lloyd-George.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Mr. Lloyd-George.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W, (Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow)
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C, W, (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt, Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn C. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heaton, John Henniker
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth)
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torreus
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C. (Monagh'n N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Sir Alexander Acland-
Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(4.12.) MR. WHITLEY said that the Amendment standing in his name dealt with one of those matters which the Prime Minister regarded as details, but which gave rise to much controversy in the country. He had several times been asked who, under the new conditions, would pay the caretaker. The duties of this official would be largely concerned with the use of the school on Sundays and for parochial purposes, and it was desirable that it should be clearly laid down whether the managers or the local authority were responsible for his salary. If the local authority paid, would they also appoint? If the managers paid, would they be able to apply the usual test as to the man being a frequent and early communicant? It was only reasonable that the caretaker should go along with the free use of the building, and the words he proposed to insert would make it quite clear.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 18, after the word 'them,' to insert the words 'pay the caretaker.'"—(*Mr. Whitley*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. Gentleman was quite right in his conjecture that he would regard this as a rather trifling matter. He did not know why the Amendment should deal only with the caretaker. Why should not the man who swept the chimneys also be brought in? These points must clearly be matters of arrangement between the local authority and the managers.

MR. M'KENNA said the local authority had only got the use of the school during certain hours of the day. What happened afterwards was no concern of the local authority.

MR. WHITLEY asked permission to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The next Amendment, standing in the name of the hon. Member for South Islington, deals with a question which has already been disposed of. It has already been decided to hand over the school free of any charge, and therefore the Amendment is not in order. The Amendment in the name of the hon. Member for Saffron Walden also raises a question which has been disposed of.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.) said the Amendment he wished to move was to the effect that the managers should supply all the educational appliances for the carrying on of the school. Many of the voluntary schools were badly equipped, and the apparatus at present provided by them was very much behind what was required now to carry on efficient work. It was quite clear that as the control of secular education had been handed over to the local education authority, they would insist upon voluntary schools bringing up their apparatus into line with the other schools of the country. His Amendment provided that, in a case of that kind, the managers should be responsible for the expense necessary to equip the school. The ownership of those schools would remain with the trustees, except when being used for the purposes of secular education. He begged to move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 18, after the word 'house,' to insert the words 'and all its educational appliances.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd Morgan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he hoped the hon. Member would not press this Amendment, because they were now dealing with the question of the building.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that in the case of desks they would be used not merely for secular education, but also for Sunday school purposes, and for what the Prime Minister had called social purposes, by the Church managers for denominational purposes. Surely these ought to be supplied by the managers. There was nothing in the Bill to indicate who had to supply these things.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the managers had to keep up the building, but as regarded the furniture required, that would be supplied by the local education authority. If the furniture was to be used for other purposes, then the expense could be divided amongst them. This Amendment would throw upon the managers the burden of providing all the educational appliances.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said there was not a single word in the Bill to indicate that. The local education authority had to maintain the staff and provide the salaries and books, but there was nothing in the Bill about providing the furniture. The Attorney General said they could divide the cost of the furniture amongst them if they wished. Could the local education authority say to the managers—"We will not allow you to use the desks for the purposes of a Sunday school." If they could not do this, then they could not impose any charge.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the local education authority had to provide the furniture for secular instruction. They could remove their furniture if they liked, but no doubt they would leave it there. This Amendment would throw upon the managers the burden of providing the whole of the furniture, which was to be mainly used for secular education.

(MR. LLOYD-GEORGE contended that that was precisely what the voluntary schools did at the present time, and the Attorney General now thought it was a gross and iniquitous thing that they should be asked to continue to provide the furniture. The hon. and learned Gentleman had skilfully evaded the question he put to him. If the managers refused to pay for the use of the furniture they could continue to use it unless the local authority took it away. It was a preposterous suggestion to say that the local authority could cart away the furniture. The local education authority were to take over the whole charge of maintaining the school for sectarian purposes; last night the Committee passed a resolution enabling the managers to make a profit out of the school-house; and now they were being asked at the expense of the State to equip Sunday schools and provide furniture for the richest denomination in the land.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON thought the answer given by the Attorney General showed that there were still one or two points which wanted clearing up. He said that the furniture, books and apparatus would be the property of the local authority. Did he mean that in the case of all these schools the local authority would have to purchase the existing apparatus from the present managers? If that were so it meant that they were giving another very large endowment to the schools. It could not be argued that the local authority were to come into possession of simply an empty house and would have to provide all the books and apparatus. Everybody thought that the schools were going to be taken over as a going concern. He should like some information upon this point because it was very germane to the Amendment under consideration. The managers would have to repair the building, but would they have to put the furniture and apparatus into a proper state of repair? Was it the idea of the Government that the local education authority would simply come into the possession of an empty building and have to buy all the books and apparatus from the existing managers of the schools?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that as regards the furniture in the schools there was nothing in the Bill about transfer to the local education authority, but he should think himself that in most cases the managers would allow the old furniture to go on being used. Some hon. Gentlemen seemed to think that there was nothing too bad to be imputed to the managers of the voluntary schools.

MR. BRYCE said that the more they avoided imputations on each side the better. This was a matter that ought to be settled in case there should be friction. Would it not be better to deal with it in the Bill? It could not be beyond the resources of the Attorney General to find words which would meet the point and be accepted by each side defining the legal rights of the local authority.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he did not think there was any obscurity whatever about the point. The managers were to provide the buildings, and the furniture would remain the property of the managers, or trustees, or whosoever in whom it was vested. If they agreed to allow the local authority to use it they might do so, and if they chose to make the local authority buy the furniture they might do so. As regards any new furniture, that, of course, must be provided by the local education authority, for they were to maintain the school. There was nothing to put the managers under any obligation except with regard to the buildings. The law was clear. He thought sometimes quite as much mischief was done by an overplus of legislation, as by a want of legislation.

Mr. BRYCE asked if it was to be understood that it would be in the power of the managers to carry away the furniture, the benches, maps, globes, ink bottles, and everything else which were now in the school and used for educational purposes, and then to say to the local authority that if they wanted those things they must pay for them.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said the right hon. Gentleman had drawn a lurid picture of what might happen. Of course, if the managers chose to do that, they could.

Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Eland) said it was perfectly true that they did not want an overplus of legislation, but legislation was to keep people in order who were not going to be reasonable, and what they complained of in this case was that something of this kind might happen. There would be a lot of old furniture, partly bought out of public grants, in a school, and if the managers chose to be unreasonable, it could be removed into the parish room. Then the school would be entirely fitted up again by the public authority, and the new desks and other furniture which the public authority had provided could be used in the evening by the very people who were keeping the old furniture.

Sir JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said he thought a protest should be made on the Government side of the House against the view stated by the Attorney General. If it was in the power of the managers throughout the country to refuse the use of the furniture now in the schools the position would be an intolerable one. He thought that would be very unfair and unjust, and that it would do a great injury to the reputation of the denominational schools. Therefore if the position was as stated by the Attorney General—and he had no doubt the hon. and learned Gentleman was correct—some words should be introduced in the Bill that the furniture and apparatus now in use in these schools should be at the disposal of the local authority in future.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said that if those interested in the voluntary schools desired that some such words should be inserted in the Bill the Government would certainly have no objection. The legal position was as he had stated it, and he believed that owing to the action of the voluntary school managers no such discredit would be brought on the schools as his hon. friend apprehended. Could the Committee imagine for a moment that there would be any of those scenes which the right hon. Gentleman opposite had conjured up? He believed that in the actual working of the Bill none of those vagaries would arise. He thought the real danger sometimes was occasioned by being too fussy in these matters and in conjuring up objections instead of leaving people to act according to their own instincts of what was right.

Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE said he wished to support the appeal made by his right hon. friend the Member for the Tewkesbury Division from the ratepayers' point of view and in the interest of the Bill itself. He could not conceive a worse start for a Bill of this description in a county than that the county authority should have to begin by paying a very large sum out of the rates of the first year for the purchase of a large portion of the existing furniture. The Attorney General said that a large number of the managers would take a liberal view, but, after all, the county authority would not be able to stand on liberality alone. They would have to consider the ratepayers, and also how they could deal fairly with all the managers. The question was whether or not they were bound in law to pay for the furniture. He could not think in the interest of the Bill itself, or in the interest of the voluntary schools, the county authority should have to start with a large burden caused by having to purchase the existing furniture.

Mr. WALLACE (Perth) said the managers would be acting in breach of duty if they did not as trustees demand the price of the furniture if the law had not laid down anything contrary to the view stated by the Attorney General. Therefore it seemed to be absolutely necessary to have the law so framed that no opportunity would be afforded for any dispute to arise.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said he thought the proper course to pursue was to postpone the discussion until a new Amendment could be brought forward at a later stage.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that what was wanted was that the Government should introduce an Amendment which would meet the views of all those who had spoken, and he asked the Attorney General to give a promise to that effect.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that two things were perfectly clear—first, that the Amendment now before the Committee would not meet the desire of every Member who had spoken, and second, that this was not the place to insert words dealing with the matter, because they were now dealing with the buildings. In accordance with what seemed to be the general wish of the Committee the Government would most carefully consider the point and see whether words could not be introduced which would give effect to that desire, although personally he did not think an Amendment was necessary.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he wished to point out that there was a large portion of the contents of the schoolrooms which was not movable furniture at all, but fixtures screwed to the floor, or otherwise.

MR. WHITLEY said that many of the school managers had very heavy debts, and if they had a right to claim compensation for furniture there would be a great temptation for them to do so in order to clear off their debts.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN said that after the promise the Attorney General had given, he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

(4.43.) SIR JOHN DORINGTON said he had been struck with what the hon. Member for North Camberwell had said in regard to the amount of repairs, and he could not help thinking that there should be some discrimination in regard to repairs. Hence he proposed that after the word "good," there should be inserted "structural." That would indicate what the landlord should do, and what a tenant should do. The tenant surely should replace a broken pane of glass, or any of the small daily repairs of a school; but on the other hand larger repairs, for instance in regard to the roof or the outside doors, should be paid for by the managers. He understood from the Secretary to the Board of Education that some general rules would be laid down under the Code. That would be quite satisfactory, but the Government should clear the matter up.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 18, after the word 'good,' to insert the word 'structural.'"—(*Sir John Dorington.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'structural' be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that the meaning of the words in the Bill "in good repair" was that it was intended to include all repairs necessary to adapt the buildings for the purposes for which they were to be used. It was perfectly clear that the words as they stood included structural repairs outside the building as well as keeping the paint and the windows in order. He thought it was better therefore to adhere to the words of the Bill, by which the responsibility was thrown upon the managers of doing all that was necessary to keep the buildings in a condition suitable for the work of a school. If they began to dissect the amount of repairs which the managers should provide in making the buildings suitable for use as a school, and the amount to be done by the local authority, he thought they would open up a very difficult subject.

* SIR CHARLES DILKE said this Amendment had been moved in a very quiet way, but they knew that it was an Amendment to which the Archbishop of Canterbury, judging from recent speeches of that Prelate, attached great

importance. He was glad that the Attorney General had taken a very different view of the Amendment from its mover. If the Amendment were to be accepted by the Committee it would be as gross a breach of the understanding as was that of which they had complained on the previous night.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he was very glad to hear the speech of the Attorney General, because it conveyed what was thoroughly understood by the Committee, viz., that it was undoubtedly the duty of the managers to keep the school buildings in a condition suitable to the purposes for which they were intended. He had received the other day a leaflet which was being printed and circulated for the Primose League by a Cambridge Newspaper Company. He did not know whether it was edited by the late Secretary to the Board of Education; but the leaflet set forth the merits of the Bill and the reasons why the public should place confidence in it. One of the arguments was that the supporters of the voluntary schools would have to provide for all repairs, but any enlargement which might be necessary would be paid for out of the local rates. It seemed to him that in proposing this Amendment an endeavour was being made to take off certain liabilities which everybody understood had been undertaken by the managers of the voluntary schools.

*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said that the right hon. the Member for Forest of Dean had stated that this was a small matter. [Sir C. DILKE: "No, I never said so."] The right hon. Gentleman quoted the Archbishop of Canterbury's speech, in which the Archbishop attached some importance to the definition of repairs. He could say that he was acquainted with a number of denominational schools which were kept open with the greatest difficulty, and only by the generous subscriptions often of very poor people who wanted to keep up the denominational character of the schools. To his knowledge the Roman Catholics had been most liberal in their contributions to the upkeep of their schools. He thought it would be most unfair to handicap the voluntary schools by compelling them to provide for repairs which in the case of board schools fell upon the rates. Why was secular education to be handicapped in voluntary schools because religious instruction was given in them? Hon. Members opposite had such a prejudice against definite religious instruction that as they could not do as was being done in France, viz., drive the denominational schools out by force, they were trying to obtain their end by the process of placing every possible burden upon them. It was no more than common fairness that those parents who desired their children to be religiously instructed should be put on the same footing as the parents of other children. He thought it was not much to ask that the local education authority should maintain the equipment for educational purposes. This Amendment was a fair one, and if they did not limit the denominational liability to structural repairs, they ought to try to define the furniture to be provided by the local authority, which he had endeavoured to do by an Amendment lower down on the Paper.

DR. MACNAMARA thought the hon. Gentleman made a mistake in endeavouring to minimise the obligations of the managers in this way. The question had been asked why should not these buildings be kept in repair out of the fund, like the School Board schools, in the future? For a very simple reason, because it was now decided that the whole cost of the education should be charged on the public fund. They had got four-sixths of the management of the schools, and in return for that it was an exceedingly small consideration that they should keep the buildings in repair? What were the figures? The voluntary subscriptions last year amounted to £840,000. It was exceedingly difficult to get definite figures, in fact it was impossible, for the cost of repairs, but gathered together were a number of items—fuel, light, cleaning, repairs, rent and taxes, and miscellaneous expenditure—and the total of those items came out at £908,700. In some cases the rent charges were very high, running up to as much as £500 a year. From those figures it was plain that the existing voluntary contributions would have nearly met not only the repairs but all these other charges as well. Supposing the voluntary contributions fell to half that amount—fell to £450,000—he still thought they would be sufficient to meet the repairs if they took the repairs at half the entire expenditure. That he thought was a fair estimate. The voluntary subscriptions amounted now to 6s. 8d. per child. If they fell to 3s., and that was the reasonable return which the voluntary subscribers might be asked to make, they would still have sufficient. He did not think it would do the denominations any good to make a huckstering bargain in this matter. For the concessions made of four-sixths of the management, the head teacher always, and the right to give denominational teaching out of public funds, this was a very small return.

*(5.10.) Mr. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) expressed the fear that the statement made by the Attorney General would give anxiety and disappointment to the managers of voluntary schools. He thought it was inconsistent with the main tenor of this Clause which put the managers in the relation of landlord and tenant, with the exception that the tenant paid no rent. It should at least be construed in such a way that the whole of what were known as tenant's repairs should be borne by the local authority which had possession of the building. If the Committee referred to sub-Section 3 of Clause 13 it would be seen that in the relations between the local authority and the parish, where there was a provided school, all the capital expenditure, and the capital expenditure alone, was to be borne by the parish. He asked that that principle might be adhered to in this case; the capital repairs, the "landlord" repairs, should be borne by the denomination, and the "tenant" repairs by the local authority. This point unfortunately was complicated by the fact that the practice of the Department in the past had not been invariable. A number of items had been allowed to be paid by the managers out of Parliamentary grants which under this definition they would be obliged to pay out of their own resources. He thought that what before they had been allowed to pay out of Parliamentary grants should now be paid by the local authority. Those were in his opinion the lines upon which a fair settlement could be effected. The right hon. Member for North East Manchester had pointed out that the minor repairs were trifling amounts, but he (Mr. Hope) had the accounts of a Wesleyan school in one district, which showed that in the last two years the minor repairs amounted to £50 last year. He earnestly hoped that before the debate closed the Attorney General would at least indicate that the Government had the intention of reconsidering this matter.

*Sir BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) on behalf of the owners and managers of the voluntary schools said they had no desire to shirk their responsibilities in this manner and get rid of the expenditure they had hitherto been put to, by putting it on public funds. They had heard too much of the Church in this debate, and how it would profit by the Bill, but the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton was right when he said that it was not so much a matter of the Church as a matter of the owner of a property. He believed that the number of schools that were said to belong to denominations was largely exaggerated. There were a great many schools which appeared in the Education Reports as Church of England schools which had no connection with the Church at all. They were "Squire's" schools, built by squires, and maintained by them. It was quite true that the squires had in times past expected the clergyman of the parish to manage the school and give the religious instruction, and it was only in latter days that the action of a section of the Church had obliged them to withdraw that duty from the clergyman, or only to allow it under conditions. But it was quite open to a squire to withdraw any of his schools from the denomination, and convert them into sectarian schools, or pull them down, or turn them into cowsheds, or do anything he pleased with them. This concession must go, therefore, into the pockets of the landlords, and he thought it was a mean Amendment, and it was mean of the landlords to accept it.

Lord HUGH CECIL said the speech of the hon. Baronet strengthened the force of the argument that he was about to use, that from the ratepayers' point of view it was not wise to drive the voluntary school managers into bankruptcy, because then the ratepayers would have to pay the whole cost of the school buildings. It was quite true that many of the schools were in the hands of the landowners, and had no strict connection with the Church in any way, and, while it was perfectly true that many religious bodies would make great sacrifices to prevent the schools going away from the denomination, there was no reason why the squire should do as he pleased with regard to them. He suggested that a middle course might be taken in this matter by enacting that, in respect of repairs, other than structural, the County Council should have a discretion to contribute if they liked. There would be no unfairness in giving a free choice to the body which the ratepayers elected.

*MR. M. WHITE RIDLEY (Stalybridge) sincerely hoped the Government would see their way to consider the suggestion of the noble Lord. As the hon. Member for North Camberwell had pointed out, taking it over the whole of the schools of the country there would probably be no difficulty in finding the money required; but to find the money in some districts would be impossible. There was no desire on the part of the voluntary school managers of any district to back out of the bargain, but there had always been an understanding that they should not run into greater liabilities than they had been able to pay out of the Government grants. In his own constituency there were twenty voluntary schools and the annual expenditure they would have to pay under the Act amounted to £1,600. The annual subscriptions amounted roughly to £800. They had been able out of the Government grants to supply the rest of the amount required for maintenance and repairs. It would be hard in that case for the managers to find more money than they had had to find in past years. Those schools were not Church alone but schools of all denominations.

MR. W. F. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby) had no desire to ignore the real hardships shown in the speech of the hon. Member for the Exchange Division. There were certainly already efficient schools with regard to which considerable cost would be thrown upon the management. He did not think this Amendment met the case so well as that of the hon. Member for the Exchange Division, lower down on the Paper. He would like to know what provision was made for the upkeep of playgrounds. In country districts they were frequently put to considerable expense in restoring the level of playgrounds. He would also like to know what provision was made for the upkeep of outside walls. He thought it should be clearly set out in the Bill whether the upkeep of playgrounds and outside walls would come in under the head of buildings.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) thought it would be most desirable to prevent any friction arising between the local education authorities and the managers of voluntary schools on the question of repairs. If the Committee tried to separate the repairs he thought they would do a great deal of harm to the voluntary schools themselves, because they must bear in mind that the use of the school was not limited to the hours of secular teaching, and they would have friction and disputes as to whether the damage took place at the time when secular or religious instruction was in progress. He thought the position of the Government should be maintained.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said before the Bill was introduced they heard a great deal of the intolerable situation of the managers of the voluntary schools. Now that the Bill had been brought in they were told by a noble Lord opposite that some of these schools would be driven into bankruptcy. The last stage was therefore worse than the first, and it was very strange that the Diocesan Councils all over the country should, under these circumstances, be in favour of the Bill. For the last three hours attempts had been made to do away with the bargain which was the basis of this Bill. The previous night the denominations were presented with the rents of their schoolhouses. That afternoon the attempt was made to give the schools the endowments which they now enjoyed. Now there was an attempt to whittle down the repairs. He was glad the Government was firm as to that, but he wished to know how many attempts were going to be made to whittle away the bargain. They had heard a great deal of this bargain, and he would be glad to know by whom it was made. It was certainly not made between one side of the House and the other. The real fact of the matter was that it was made between the Government, as trustees for the people, and the owners of the Church schools. It would be interesting to know at that period how the profit and loss account stood. So far the public got the use of the school during school hours and on three evenings in the week. Against that the denominations had first, two-thirds of the managers. Secondly, the appointment of all the teachers, and secured the religious atmosphere which they wanted. Thirdly, they had the use of the school buildings outside school hours. Fourthly, they had the use of the buildings for Sunday school purposes. Fifthly, they got the rent of the school-house, a not inconsiderable asset; and, lastly, they could, if their schools were wanted for technical instruction for more than three days a week, take a share of the whiskey money. It seemed to him that the policy was a one-sided one, and he trusted that, if if any further proposals were made of this kind, the Government would remember they were the trustees of the people, and would deal with Convocation in a stronger manner than they had hitherto done.

MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) quite agreed that the question of repairs was a very important one, which ought to be dealt with according to the lines laid down in the Bill. Here they were not dealing particularly with Church schools or denominational schools, but with all the schools not provided by the local authority, many of them being schools in private hands. He admitted that there was a heavy burden cast on the owners of the schools, but according to the principles of the Bill, they should bear it in return for certain advantages obtained. It would be a great mistake to attempt to make the burden too light, and certainly nothing could be worse than the recurrence of constant friction as to repairs. He supported the position taken up by the Attorney General, that no one except the owner should deal with the fabric of the schools, and that it should be his duty to maintain the fabric in such a condition as to be fitted for educational purposes.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he was speaking of repairs. So far as repairs were concerned, both inside and out, the managers should keep the schools in a condition fit for educational purposes. So far as cleaning was concerned, that was a different matter altogether.

*MR. TALBOT (Oxford University) said he wanted to know, what the bargain was. He understood that all external repairs were to be done by the representative managers of the school, but the Attorney General rather frightened him by speaking of inside as well as outside repairs. In keeping the building in repair, one important point was to keep it clean. Who was to provide the cleaning of the school, which could hardly be called "repairs" in the ordinary sense? If the walls became dirty, who was to whitewash them? Those were points which, perhaps, might sound trivial to the Committee, but they were points on which friction might arise, and it was desirable to clear them up. Again, what was to happen in the case of a broken window? Whether they differed or not, it was most desirable that they should know what the provision meant. What he had understood was that the fabric and its repairs were to be maintained by the owners, but that all else would be left in the hands of the local authority. That, however, was now to be pressed further, and the owners were not only to maintain the walls, chimneys, and other parts of the fabric, but to maintain the inside of the building, to do the painting, whitewashing, glazing, and so forth. He was not saying that he objected to that, or that it was an unfair bargain, but he wanted to know what the bargain really was, and then he would be able to form an opinion about it.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) repudiated the idea of there being any bargain in this matter. What they were trying to do was to act fairly between the local authority, as representing the ratepayers, on the one side, and the trustees of the school on the other. The Liverpool Public Elementary School Managers Committee, a body representing all the schools, both voluntary and board, in Liverpool, had resolved—

> "That the reasonable cost of the wear and tear of the buildings should, as at present, be included under the head of maintenance, and allowed accordingly."

The ground of that view was that if the use of the school was given free of charge it was surely only fair that the local authority should bear the charges incidental to use. A school could not be used without a certain amount of wear and tear, and to make good that wear and tear was just as much a part of the cost of maintenance as teachers' salaries. In the past it had always been allowed by the Education Department under the head of maintenance. It was a mistake to try to drive too hard a bargain with the school managers. If Members desired to put an end to voluntary schools let them do so boldly, but they ought not to subject the schools to a lingering death by placing upon the shoulders of the managers a burden heavier than they could bear.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) reminded the Committee that at present voluntary school managers had to distinguish between two sources of revenue when meeting a demand for repairs. Structural repairs had to be met out of capital expenditure, so that in that respect the managers under the Bill would be in no worse case in the future. The cost of small internal repairs might, by leave of the Board of Education, be charged upon the maintenance fund. But at present the managers had some £800,000 in voluntary subscriptions. In future that sum would not have to be raised for the general expenses of the schools, and so would be applicable to these internal repairs. Therefore the Bill would not injure the managers in either respect.

(5.38.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 35; Noes, 337. (Division List No. 435.)

AYES.

Bain, Colonel James Robert
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Carew, James Laurence
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Malcolm, Ian
Morrell, George Herbert
Myers, William Henry
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Round, Right Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.

Tellers for the Ayes—
Sir John Dorington and
Sir James Fergusson.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bartley, George C. T.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Bull, William James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Butcher, John George
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, Rt Hon J A (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cawley, Frederick
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Channing, Francis Allston

Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cremer, William Randal
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Dalziel, James Henry
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Edwards, Frank
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Ellis, John Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Gladstone, Rt Hon Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby- (Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Grant, Corrie
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir. E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Guthrie, Walter Murray

Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Knowles, Lees
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, William F (Liverpool
Lawson, John Grant
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lecky, Rt Hon William Edw. H.
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Logan, John William
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire

Manners, Lord Cecil
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Moulton, John Fletcher
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newnes, Sir George
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Palmer Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Price, Robert John
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Shackleton, David James
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)

Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, RtHnC.R.(Northants
Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Stewart, SirMark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E)
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A(Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir CEH(Sheffield
Wallace, Robert
Walrond, RtHonSirWilliamH.
Walton, JohnLawson(Leeds, S.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E.(Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E.(Notts
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whiteley, H(Ashton-und. Lyne
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, RtHnJ Powell-(Birm
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Woodhouse, SirJ T (Huddersf'd
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(5.55.) DR. MACNAMARA said he imagined that there could be no doubt that the managers would have to find the heating apparatus, but the local authority would have to find the fuel. He wished to have the views of the Government on the matter.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the managers would have to arrange for the apparatus for warming and lighting, but the local authority would have to provide the fuel and lighting.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN asked if lighting meant to put all windows into proper repair.

*THE CHAIRMAN : Of course; a house without windows could not be in a proper state of repair.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN said the matter was not so easily disposed of. There might be a question whether "lighting" meant artificial lighting.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: But we are not accepting these words.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) thought the local education authority ought to be entitled to see whether the buildings were in good repair or not. It was desirable that at the outset there should be something like a standard of repair set up covering all buildings, and the standard ought to be fixed by the local authority and not by the managers.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 18, after the word 'repair,' to insert the words 'to the satisfaction of.'"—(*Mr. Corrie Grant.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the words proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman made the local authority the final judge in any dispute which arose between them and the local managers. Although he was certain that that was not the intention of the hon. and learned Gentleman, that would be the effect of them, and the hon. and learned Gentleman was certainly mistaken if he thought that with these words in there would be any appeal to the Board of Education. There would be nothing of the kind.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I find on looking back that the hon. Member for the Attercliffe Division was right. In the proposal of the hon. Member for East Somerset to insert the words "so long as" this point was dealt with. That Amendment would be applicable to all the conditions. The question raised by this Amendment therefore is already decided.

MR. BRYCE on a point of order asked whether it would not be possible for the House to annex a condition to this particular condition which was applicable to all.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the Amendment of the hon. Member for East Somerset would apply to all the conditions, and therefore he thought this Amendment ought not to be pressed. The question had already been decided.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS said the object of the Amendment he now proposed to move was again to avoid, if possible, the friction which must inevitably take place between the local authority and the managers if the word "reasonably" was not omitted from the Bill. They had passed from "repairs" to "improvements and alterations" which were to be made at the instance of the local authority. This question of improvements and alterations was a very important factor in the situation. He deeply deplored the arrangements made in this Bill, and did not think it would be possible to maintain them for any length of time, but that was not the point which was now at issue. They had to accept the policy of the Bill, and all they had to decide was the form. The Government were as anxious as anybody that the denominational school buildings should be in a satisfactory condition structurally, but the Committee were aware that when the Bill passed considerable alterations and improvements would be made in them. It would be only human nature on the part of the managers to cut down as far as possible the expenses in connection with these required alterations, and the result might be to lower the standard of excellence of the buildings and cause a certain amount of friction between them and the local authority. The question raised by the Amendment was whether the local education authority could be trusted. It ought to bring to its service the best elements of the county; it would represent the judgment and opinion of the majority of the inhabitants, and he could not see any reason why in a matter of this kind they could not be trusted to say what was to be done to these buildings in order to bring them up to the required standard of excellence.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 20, to leave out the word 'reasonably:' "—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'reasonably' stand part of the Clause."

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said the Attorney-General and the First Lord of the Treasury had consistently stated that they regarded the local education authority as a reasonable body, and one fit to act in matters far more important than this, and, when the Opposition had alleged any difficulty with regard to the machinery, asked why it should not be left with the local authority. It was assumed that this great authority, the basis of education in this country, might act unreasonably. Sub-Section 2 gave all the powers that were required. They had in that sub-Section the power to settle a question by reference to the Education Department, and it was not necessary to go further. This was not a question of a reasonable dispute, but a question of this Government authority having acted unreasonably. It was most humiliating to the local authority. A great dispute might arise between the managers and the education authority as to whether a school should be whitewashed or not. The local authority might make a demand that the managers should whitewash the school, then there would be correspondence and a reference to the Board to determine whether, in deciding that the school was not to be whitewashed, the Borough Council had acted unreasonably. Such a course would only be humiliating and cause reasonable irritation. The Secretary to the Education Department would be the final judge as to whether the whitewash should be applied or not. These disputes would occur every day, and the use of the word "unreasonable" would be nothing less than a gross insult. The Committee knew perfectly well that whenever the authority made demands of this kind there was a fighting party on the other side which would always take them before the Department, and all this would raise totally unnecessary friction. The education authority was the only body chosen for the purpose of being afflicted with this expression. He very much regretted that the Government would not trust the local authority to decide in the matter instead of putting it out to be dry-nursed. The one thing that divided mankind more than anything else was the expenditure of money, and in this case those who would desire to reduce the expenditure would be the managers. Everything that cost 6d. would be declared to be unreasonable, and a coat of whitewash would be represented as putting on an intolerable strain. He believed that the effect would be to cause unnecessary friction between the parties, and he asked why in the name of common sense and good feeling it could not be left to the County Councils not to make unreasonable demands.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the Government could not possibly accept this Amendment. He did not for a moment believe that the local authority in any part of the country would administer the Act in an unreasonable spirit; but, after all, local authorities were but human.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: So is Whitehall.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said local authorities were liable to an occasional lapse; and with regard to the right hon. Gentleman, for whom he had a great respect, he should be sorry to say that he had never been unreasonable in his demands on the Government in this and in many other matters. With every respect to the local authorities, there might be occasions when their requirements would be of a very offensive character with regard to a particular school, and when the alterations and improvements in the school might involve amounts of money which the managers had not at command, and thus sink the school as a voluntary school altogether.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS said that if the hon. and learned Attorney General would refer to sub-Section (*a*), he would see that the managers were compelled to carry out the direction of the local education authority as to the secular instruction of the school. If the principle was to apply in such an important matter as secular instruction, why should it not apply to this? The Amendment was a perfectly sound Amendment, and if the Government were consistent they would accept it.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that, as he understood the position taken up by the Government, if they did not put in the word "reasonably" there could be no appeal to the Education Department. He submitted that that was not so, because under Clause 10 there would be an appeal.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said this Amendment did not concern repairs, but alterations and improvements.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON did not see the difference. It seemed to him that if the word reasonable was required in one case it should be required in the other. This was casting a very considerable reflection on the local education authority in whom, it was understood, the Government had the fullest confidence and to whom they wished to give the fullest possible power. He would support the Amendment.

MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.) said he accepted the Attorney General's construction of the Section, but he thought sub-Section 2 was so wide that it might with great advantage be restricted. Ambiguity would be avoided if, for the words "If any question arises," they substituted "If any question whether the conditions above-mentioned have been complied with arises." Then the only question which could arise would be a question between the managers and the local authority as to whether or not the managers had complied with the conditions which created an obligation on the education authority to maintain the schools. If the word "reasonably" was left out of sub-Section (*d*), the only questions which could arise would be whether the school-house was in good repair and whether alterations and improvements were in fact required. If the word "reasonably" was kept in, there would be an appeal to the Board of Education.

(6.33.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 247; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 436.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt Hon. A. J. (Manch'r.
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund

Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles,T.Gibson(King'sLynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, AlexanderH.(Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell,RtHn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,RtHn.J A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane,Hon.ThomasH.A.E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb,SirJohnCharlesReady
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox,Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross,Herb.Shepherd(Bolton)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chath'm
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D .Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon.Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes,Hon.AilwynEdward
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald,Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hon.Vicary(St.Albans)
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gore,Hn.GR.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst,Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(B'ryS Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury
Greene,W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S.W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Henry (Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier,Hon.James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Lawson, John Grant
Lecky,Rt.Hn.WilliamEdw.H.
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col.Francis(Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth)
Macartney,Rt.Hn.W.G.Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell,RtHnSirHE.(Wigt'n
Milner,Rt.Hn.SirFrederickG.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott(Hants.)
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham(Bath
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.JohnP.(Galway,N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Peel, Hn.Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington,Lieut.-Col.Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan,Sir William Henry
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley,Hon.M.W(Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith,HC(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith,Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley,Hn.Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt,Hon.Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson,DrEC(Monagh'n,N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,ColSirC.E.H(Sheffield
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunt'n
Welby,Sir CharlesG.E.(Notts.
Whiteley,H(Ashton-und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson,A. Stanley (York,E.R.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wortley,Rt.Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellis, John Edward
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone
and Mr. Causton.

(6.52.) MR. ALFRED HUTTON said he wished to move an Amendment to provide for cases where there was a division of opinion between the local authorities and the managers, and where the managers declined to carry out any reasonable requirement in regard to the improvement of the school buildings. Supposing that an appeal had been made to the Education Department, that the Department had given its decision in favour of the local authority, and that the managers found that they were unable to carry out the improvement, or that the people interested in the school refused to carry out the structural alteration of the school. The purpose of the Amendment was to settle that point. Suppose a school was satisfactory for ordinary purposes, but that it was desirable to add another class-room on an adjacent piece of ground which was suitable and available. If the managers refused to add the class-room would it be necessary for the education authority to build an entirely new school? He thought his Amendment was very reasonable and would prevent any unwarrantable addition to the expenses of the managers. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 20, after the word 'authority,' to insert the words 'and if the managers are unable or unwilling to carry out these requirements, or fail to carry them out with due despatch, the local education authority shall have the right themselves to make such repairs, alterations, and improvements as are sanctioned by the Board of Education, and any school thereafter maintained in such buildings shall be held to be a school provided by that authority.'"—(*Mr. Alfred Hutton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted '

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he could hardly believe that the hon. Gentleman had fully realised the effect of his Amendment, which amounted to this, that if the local authority was not satisfied with the speed with which the repairs were carried out, they could become owners of property which did not belong to them. Anybody could see for himself that the deduction of the hon. Gentleman was monstrous, and he hoped that a proposal so repugnant to the most elementary principles of justice would not be pressed.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said it might be that the remedy suggested by his hon. friend was a drastic remedy, but the difficulty contemplated in the Amendment might easily arise. The remedy provided in the Bill by the right hon. Gentleman was no remedy at all, and the First Lord had really given no answer to his hon. friend. He was willing to consider any counter-suggestion of the Government, and reason with them in regard to the remedy which ought to be provided in the case stated. He had a perfectly open mind on the subject; but there could be no doubt that a remedy ought to be provided, because it might be that it was desirable that certain things should be done in the schools, but that the managers had not the money to put the buildings in repair. The repairs ought to be carried out either by the local authority, or by decision of the Board of Education in London. What was to be done in cases where the managers would do nothing at all? He asked the Attorney General whether there was to be a *mandamus*, and if the managers did not carry out their duties were they to go to prison, and was the school to be allowed to get out of repair? The local education authority would eventually have to undertake the work, and, knowing that, the managers would say, "We won't trouble about the matter, we won't do anything at all." Unless the proposal of his hon. friend were amended, it would by implication say that the subject of repairs, as well as the question of improvements, and so forth, was to be a matter of appeal. But it was really necessary that the Prime Minister should explain his remedy for this difficulty, which not only might but was almost bound to arise.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) hoped the Committee would forgive him for referring to the Education Bill of 1896, but that measure contained a remedy for this very difficulty. By a Clause in that Bill the managers were enabled to borrow, and the local authority might lend sums of money for the purpose of repairs and structural improvements, the loans being secured by a mortgage on the buildings. Some such provision as that would meet the difficulty now raised. If the managers had not the funds to carry out certain alterations, they would then be able to borrow from the local authority, and make the necessary improvements. When, by means of a bazaar, subscriptions or collections, the managers were able to repay the money, the loan would be returned, but until then interest would have to be paid. If it ultimately became impossible for the managers to repay the money, the local authority would foreclose. The building would then be sold, the local authority would probably purchase it for a school, they would repay themselves the loan, and hand over the balance to the trustees for the purposes of the trust. That Clause, at the time, met with a great deal of approval on all sides, and possibly something of the kind might be proposed now.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that whether or not the proposed remedy was the best was a subject for discussion, but it was clear that a real difficulty existed. Personally he preferred the remedy appearing lower on the Paper in the name of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick, and which met the objection raised by the Prime Minister as to the proposal being one of confiscation. The supporters of the Amendment had no confiscatory intentions; they desired to meet the difficulty by giving fair compensation. The Prime Minister must surely realise that something ought to be done. One constantly heard of buildings, especially in rural districts, absolutely unfitted for young children to be cooped up in for several hours per day. It was really atrocious that they should be drawn to them, and inasmuch as they were compelled by law to attend, the law ought to protect their health. Buildings which would not be tolerated under a School Board were passed over when in the hands of voluntary managers, because the inspector knew perfectly well that to insist on the necessary alterations would mean bankruptcy and a School Board. He hoped all that would be changed when this Bill came into operation. If a means of meeting the difficulty were provided there would be no inducement to inspectors to pass the matter over in the future. The first condition of efficient education in the rural districts was to have schools fitted for the purpose, and he hoped the Prime Minister, before the Amendment of the right hon. Baronet came on, would consider the difficulty and how to meet it. As a point of order, he asked whether the discussion in the present Amendment would preclude the consideration of the proposal standing in the name of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) explained that what he intended was to insert a provision which would apply to all the conditions, whereas the present Amendment applied to only one condition.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think the right hon. Baronet would be entitled to move his Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR was of opinion that the plan of the Government did provide a remedy. It penalised every voluntary school which refused to carry out the reasonable instructions of the education authority in this matter of buildings by practically depriving them of maintenance. They would cease to have any right to be maintained as voluntary schools, and then, no doubt, it would be the business of the local education authority to find accommodation for the children. It might be said that that would throw a burden on the rates. That was so. It was one of the reasons why the Government had been anxious to preserve the voluntary schools that their preservation would prevent a very great additional burden being thrown on the ratepayers of the country. No doubt, if in any district the voluntary schools were incapable of bearing the burden which this Bill would throw upon them, the consequence would be that in that district a burden would be thrown on the rates. But they did not remove that evil by robbing the owners of the voluntary schools.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: That is not suggested.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he knew that that was not the intention, but though the word "compensation" appeared in the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick, he thought that word would have to be interpreted in a somewhat different manner if it was not to inflict hardship on the owners of voluntary schools. The case had been considered by the Government, and, in their view, if the managers of voluntary schools could not do the work that this Bill threw upon them, there was no choice but that the local education authority should do it.

MR. BRYCE asked the right hon. Gentleman if he had considered the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University of reviving the Clause in the Bill of 1896.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said his right hon. friend's suggestion was well worthy of consideration, but that Clause occurred in a Bill which did not provide that the rates should maintain denominational schools. The two Bills differed fundamentally, and he thought there might be certain objections, from the point of view of hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the Committee, to enabling the managers of the schools at a particular moment to engage in financial operations and impose on themselves financial obligations which might, at no distant date, have the effect of transferring those schools from the denomination to the local authority. He would, however, consider the matter.

(7.15.) MR. BRYCE said he thought the right hon. Gentleman was mixing up totally different cases. Many of those denominational schools belonged to private owners. Everybody agreed that the private owner was entitled to sell his school at the best market price, for he was as much the owner of the school as he was of his watch, and could make any terms he pleased. In the case of a trust it was entirely different, because the trustees were not beneficial owners.

With regard to the difficulty raised by the right hon. Gentleman, he wished to state why the remedy suggested was not sufficient, and why he preferred the remedy suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwick, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, and the hon. Member who had moved this Amendment. The proposal of the Government involved two difficulties. In the first place, it involved delay in providing another school and leaving the children without a school meanwhile. In the second, place it threw upon the ratepayers the necessity of erecting another school. The remedy the right hon. Gentleman appealed to was not the one which best met the case.

Mr. LAWSON WALTON said that there was one observation made by the Prime Minister which ought not to pass unchallenged. The right hon. Gentleman had stated there was a section which enforced compliance with these conditions in the nature of a penalty upon the denomination in the event of the conditions not being complied with, the penalty being that the premises which were devoted to the purposes of a school ceased to exist, and financial support was cut off, the school building being left in the hands of the trustees and no longer available for the purposes of an elementary school. That was said to be a penalty, but that seemed to him to be a very handsome bonus to the denomination. Take the ordinary derelict parish school, which could not carry out the repairs required. Suppose this school refused to give effect to the directions issued by the local education authority, and the Education Department decides the question against the school and the grant was consequently cut off. The First Lord said there was a penalty upon the denomination, because the school could no longer be used for the purposes of education. But that enabled that property generally to be applied to ecclesiastical purposes. If they had a school impressed with a trust deed in favour of education, and the local authority provided other buildings, how could they give effect to that trust. The answer would be that the Act of Parliament had relieved the trust of the bligation, and that the property in their hands would be applicable to other purposes. That appeared to be a handsome inducement to the denomination not to carry out these onerous requirements in order that the property might remain in their hands, and be applied to other purposes. He only pointed this out at that stage because, when the Committee came to the question what was a fair compensation, some of them on the opposite side of the House would be prepared to submit that there could be no compensation at all in the case of a school protected by an education trust deed. In such a case there was no authority to receive compensation in the event of a trust property being applied to such purposes.

*The CHAIRMAN: We cannot discuss compensation until it is proposed, and there is no compensation proposed here.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said he wished to point out the direction which he thought the remedy ought to take. He believed that a more suitable remedy could be found. Instead of having mortgages and foreclosures, they ought to pursue the analogy provided by the Public Health Act. Under that Act if certain improvements were required to make buildings sanitary, and the owners failed to carry out those improvements, the local authority could carry them out and make the cost a charge upon the owners. In the case of this Bill he thought the best way would be to enable the local authority to effect the improvements and make it a charge upon the premises. When they were dealing with trust estates he thought the course suggested by the right hon. Gentleman was not the right remedy. There were ample precedents for the course he had suggested, which was perfectly reasonable in its character.

(7.23.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 101; Noes, 241. (Division List No. 437.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone,RtHn.HerbertJohn
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt.Hon.Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol,E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley,Rt.Hn.John(Montrose
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Partington, Oswald
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas,JA(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton,JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York. E.R.)
Whiteley,George(York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson,HenryJ.(York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,SirJT(Huddersfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Alfred Hutton and Mr. Samuel Evans.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen,AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A. J.(Manch'r
Balfour,RtHn GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R.(Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst,Hon.Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles,T.Gibson (King's Lynn
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown,Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell,RtHn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain,Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb,SirJohnCharlesReady
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,SirHoratio D.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon.Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford,Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt. Hn.SirWilliam Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. AilwynEdward
Fergusson,Rt. HnSirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald,Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy,Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs,Hon. Vicary(St.Albans)
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore,Hon.S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirEW(B'ryS.Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus

Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H. C. (North'b. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

It being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

OPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PICCADILLY, CITY, AND NORTH-EAST LONDON RAILWAYS BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).

(9.0.) MR. ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton): I should like to ask, Sir, if you are going to rule me out of order in moving the Motion in my name on the London United Electric Railways Bill (Lords), to recommit that Bill to the former Committee.

*MR. SPEAKER: Yes, that is what I am going to do.

MR. ASHTON: Shall I be in order in proceeding with my second Motion?

*MR. SPEAKER: As to the Piccadilly, City, and North-East London Railway Bills?

MR. ASHTON: Yes.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member will be in order in proceeding with that.

MR. ASHTON said his Motion was one for the recommittal of the Piccadilly, City, and North-East London Railways Bill. He hoped it would be in order for him also to deal with the Instruction which stood in his name with regard to the same Bill.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not at liberty to move the Instruction at the same time, but he can state his reasons why he desires to recommit the Bill.

MR. ASHTON said that was his position. He could hardly explain his reasons for moving to recommit without dwelling upon the instruction which would have to be moved if the recommittal were allowed by the House. His object was to enable the Committee to deal with this Bill after being obliged, in somewhat unusual circumstances, to refuse to pass the preamble. He did so because the circumstances were of a very peculiar character. But, in the first place, he wished to explain that this action was not due to any personal interest, as he had not a shilling's worth of interest in the schemes, and had never met any of the promoters. But he took an interest on public grounds, and it arose from the fact that he had served on the Joint Committee of the Houses of Lords and Commons which had approved of the scheme for a through route from North-East London to Hammersmith. He was led to believe, as a result of that Committee's investigations, that these tube railways would be of such advantage to London, that when this scheme came forward he gave it his support. When he saw there was a chance of its being lost, he thought it his duty to put a notice on the Paper, in order to save it in the public interest, should that be possible. The tube schemes were of enormous importance to the public, inasmuch as they would relieve the congestion of traffic, greatly facilitate rapid transit over the Metropolis, and tend more to the solution of the problem of the housing of the working classes than any number of houses that could be built under municipal auspices. It had been decided by the original Committee, whose object was to lay down routes and recommend the conditions on which the tube railways should be sanctioned, that no route was better than that followed by the two Bills that had come down this session from the House of Lords. That route was from North-East London to the City, and from the City to Hammersmith. This session there was another set of Bills, proposing railways along the route from Hammersmith to Piccadilly and the City. It became necessary to decide which were the best Bills to adopt. Amongst these were the Bills by the Morgan group—the Piccadilly, City, and North-East London Railways Bill—and another Bill by the United Electric Railways Company for a line from Hammersmith to Charing Cross. There was also a Bill promoted by the Central London Railway. For some reason, with which he was not acquainted, the United Electric Railways Company and the Morgan group decided that instead of competing before the Committee they would join hands and form a through route from Hammersmith to the north-east of London. In this form the Bill came before the House of Lords. In the end the Central London scheme was thrown out in favour of the United Electric Railways scheme, which was passed by the Lords and came down to the Commons, where there was a long Second Reading debate, the result of which was that an instruction was given to the Committee to ensure that the through route should be carried out in its integrity. The Committee sat last Tuesday week, and, to the surprise of the Morgan group, who had not the slightest intimation that their allies and partners were going to take any action against them, the promoters of the Electric Railways Company's part of the through route came forward and informed the Committee that they proposed to withdraw their Bill. The Committee, owing to their instruction to insist on the through route, were thus placed in a very awkward position. It became impossible to go on with the other Bill, for they could not give effect to the instruction to insist on a through route, and the result was that the preamble was not proved. Although they were obliged to take this action, this did not alter the fact that the Morgan group had, in his opinion, been extremely hardly used. He now came to the most unpleasant part of his task, that of dealing with the treatment meted out by the United Electric Railways promoters towards their partners, after they had entered into pledges with them and with Parliament in regard to the through route. It appeared to him that a very dishonourable transaction had taken place on the part of the promoters of the United Electric Railways. They had entered into a contract with the Morgan group for the whole of this railway; they had made an agreement with them that they would mutually promote their Bills in the joint interests of the two railways. In spite of this, and without consulting the Morgan interest, they threw over their Bill. He knew they said they could not get the Morgan group to come to an agreement. But that was because they asked the Morgan group later in the day to give them half the interest and control of the joint railway from Hammersmith to the north of London. He would ask the House to remember that they were only to find three-eighths of the capital while the Morgan group were to provide five-eighths. Mr. White, one of the promoters of the United Electric Railways Company, stated before the House of Lords Committee, when questioned, that there would be one management and a joint board of directors according to their respective interests. In spite of that the United Electric group said that they had broken off negotiations because the Morgan group would not agree to their terms. Of course they would not agree, because, since that statement was made, they had been asking more than when the arrangement was entered into between the two companies. He was afraid that was only an excuse; the fact was that they were prepared to sell what they had got if a higher bidder could be found. He had heard it said that the shares which had been sold were offered to the Morgan group, who could have bought them if they had liked, but he had it on the best authority that Messrs. Morgan were prepared to assert that since the introduction of these Bills the shares had never been offered to them at all. That was not all. The Morgan group were to share with the United Electric Railway promoters in the ownership of the line from Hammersmith to Hyde Park Corner, although the United Electric Railway only appeared as the promoters of the Bill, and they had taken advantage of the fact that their names alone appeared on the Bill to withdraw it from the cognisance of the House. He doubted whether for a long time, if ever, such a very dirty transaction was ever done by parties coming before Parliament, and he thought, if on no other ground, the Morgan group deserved great consideration at the hands of the House from the fact that they had been shabbily treated. There was a bigger question than that. Not only had the Morgan group been badly treated, but Parliament had been tricked in this matter. It was the intention of Parliament that this through route should be made. The House of Lords was induced to pass those Bills, and after all the time and trouble that had been spent, the very instruction which was put in by the House of Commons for the sake of getting them through was absolutely being used against the Houses of Parliament for the purpose of destroying that route. Parliament had been played within the matter, and Parliament ought to show its resentment by giving the Morgan group a chance of passing their Bill through the House of Commons. As to the opposition to the Bill, it was stated in a circular issued by the Central London Railway Company that the Bill ought not to be allowed to pass now because it would mean a different scheme. But if the Committee thought fit to allow the Morgan group to continue their line to Hammersmith as he suggested in his instruction there would be no difference of scheme. It was suggested that the scheme of the Central London Company ought to have a chance. He could not agree with that. In accordance with the wishes of the Joint Committee, the Morgan line provided for a through route, whereas the Central London only proposed to run from Hammersmith to the City and entirely left out North East London and the congested districts there. Next he would like to point out that the original scheme provided for railways *plus* tramways, but whether the line was made by the United Electric Railways or the Morgan group the tramways would be there, and, inasmuch as the United Company's tramways were, as he was informed, made under the Light Railways Act, it was perfectly possible for the Morgan group to ask the Board of Trade to give them through fares. The opposition of the London County Council was to him a matter of considerable surprise when he thought of the congested districts which would benefit from this line. He supposed the County Council did not wish others to make tubes because they were thinking of applying for power to make tubes themselves. Judging from the love there was in the House for the County Council, it was not very likely that that body would be able to induce the House to give them the power within a reasonable time, and it ought not therefore to put its spoke in the wheel of other people who were prepared to make tube railways for the benefit of London. That being so, why should London wait? He was by no means opposed to these railways being under the control of the Council, but that was no reason why the schemes of other people should be rejected, especially when the result would be to throw a larger monopoly into the hands of the District Company. He had no animus against that company, but even a railway was brought into a healthier condition by competition. The very fact that this Bill had been brought before Parliament had caused the District Company to lower their fares along certain routes, and was it likely that if direct competition were got rid of the fares would be kept down. By restricting the number of tube railways they were giving a very dangerous monopoly to the District Railway. It had been stretching out its arms like an octopus over these tube railways. It had secured the control of the Brompton and Piccadilly line, the Charing Cross and Hampstead, and the Baker Street, Waterloo, and Great Northern schemes. Was it likely that all this had been done with the idea of developing traffic in the interests of the public of London? His own impression was that in the case of some of these contemplated railways the District Company had obtained control simply for the purpose of preventing the lines being constructed. He would give the House his reason for saying so. In 1897 they got control of the proposed Brompton and Piccadilly railway, but had done nothing with regard to it since, their object being to prevent the construction of such a line in order that no traffic might be diverted from their own system. That was no reason why they should prevent others from making other tube railways. Another objection which had been raised to the Bill was that it proposed to run two tubes under Piccadilly. He did not propose to argue that point. That was really a question for the Committee upstairs. But the House of Lords, which was generally disposed to look after the interests of property, had allowed the Bill to pass, notwithstanding the proposed two tubes under Piccadilly. He wished to meet another objection which he had heard made. It was said, "Oh, throw out this Bill; we don't want to Americanise our institutions." All he could say was that the only people who would gain by the throwing out of the Bill were the District Railway, so that if the House rejected the American Morgan they would throw themselves into the arms of the American Yerkes. He asked, were they who had sent their capital abroad to assist the enterprises of other nations to turn round and declare, for the sake of saying "England for the English," that they should not have American capital for British enterprises for which they could not obtain British money? He thought that was a sufficient answer on this point. Why should this Bill not be dropped? In the first place because he had made out some case for the promoters. The Morgan group had been very badly treated in respect to the Bill. The next point he made was that Parliament had already spent an enormous amount of time on these Bills. There had been a Joint Committee, and a Committee of the House of Lords had sat for seven weeks on these Bills this year. If the Bill now before the House was a good one, why should they throw it out simply for the sake of allowing a lot of other people to come in and give Parliament more trouble with other Bills next year. He came now to a far more important point, and that was the question of cost. A vast amount of money had already been spent on these Bills, and when he heard people lightly say "Oh, they have been quarrelling among themselves; throw the Bill out, and let them come again," he rather thought that they did not know what an enormous cost it had been. The Morgan group alone had spent £50,000 or £60,000 at least in the promotion of this Bill. [AN HON. MEMBER: "£80,000."] The petitioners had also spent money, and if the House threw the Bill out now all these costs would be incurred again in bringing forward a new Bill next session. He asked the House to pass the Bill for the construction of the line from North-East London to the West End, binding the promoters to bring in another Bill next session for continuing the line to Hammersmith, and at the same time requiring guarantees that the first Bill should not come into operation until the second Bill had been carried. By that means the House would secure the construction of the through route.

Motion made and Question proposed—"That the Piccadilly, City, and North-East London Railways Bill [Lords] be re-committed to the former Committee."—(*Mr. Ashton.*)

*(9.39.) MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said he had taken an active interest in this Bill because it would affect a portion of East London with which he was intimately connected. That district was crowded with a population whose welfare depended upon rapid transit to the heart of the Metropolis from the outskirts of London, whether they could find cheap and healthy homes such as the proposed scheme would afford them. Of all the schemes submitted to the House in regard to the tube railway system of London none could be more beneficial than that which was presented in this Bill, even in its present truncated form. He asked the House to remember that such limitations as had been placed on the through route originally contemplated by the promoters of the Bill were due not to their action, but in some measure to the technicalities connected with the procedure of Parliament. The position which the promoters occupied in the House of Commons at present was simply that they were disqualified from proceeding by the fact that they had obeyed the decision of Parliament in regard to the route taken. He heartily hoped that they would have some guidance on the highly technical matters of procedure from his right hon. friend the Chairman of Committees. It seemed to him to be a hardship well worthy of the consideration of the House, that frontagers whose property might be affected by the provisions of Bills to be presented to Parliament in the ensuing session should be put to the expense of again defending their rights if the present Bill were rejected on account of a technicality arising from the circumstances which had been described. With regard to the question of monopoly he reminded the House that if no competitive facilities were given, the District Railway and its allies would have an absolute monopoly of all transit facilities north of the Thames. In their proposals before Parliament of the public outside there was not a vestige of a serious proposal to deal with the most congested districts of London, or to serve the outer areas by cheap fares and through routes. He felt, from his knowledge of working-class life in London, that this question did not admit of any delay. The hon. Member for the Luton Division had referred to the intention of the London County Council to promote legislation next session on the subject. Whatever that body might have in its mind one fact was certain, that before any proposals put forward by the London County Council could become law considerable time must elapse, and very possibly this tube railway question of the Metropolis might become a political party question and thus be unduly and harmfully delayed. He therefore hoped that the House would recommit the Bill so that a through route from the east and north of London to Hyde Park might be authorised this session, provided that guarantees were secured from the promoters that next session they would seek powers to carry the railway on to Hammersmith and thus give an absolute through route at through rates.

*SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham) said the carefully-prepared speech of the hon. Member for the Luton Division was one which the whole House must have recognised as a plea for the Morgan group. He wished to recall the House back to the point, namely, was it the business of this House to consider and study the internal differences and speculations of rival promoters? That was not the concern of Parliament. The Morgan scheme, which was sanctioned by Parliament three months ago, fulfilled almost to the letter the recommendations made two years ago by the Joint Committee on the question of laying down routes for London from Hammersmith through Piccadilly and the City and on to Tottenham and Palmer's Green. The present was a totally different scheme. It did not carry out the through route, neither did it carry out the through fares sanctioned in the former scheme, nor the scheme of workmen's fares embodied in that scheme. He would not labour the point further. His hon. friend opposite said that although the Bill appeared in an emasculated form, another Bill would be introduced next session. A pledge from the promoters that they would introduce a Bill next session was of no practical value from the Parliamentary point of view. Next session might see a more advantageous scheme. From that point of view, therefore, he maintained that the House would be seriously wrong in passing this session this scheme in its truncated and emasculated form. It would be absurd, too, for the House to take into account any feeling of sympathy for individual promoters, or to pay regard to the internal dissensions which had taken place and sanction a scheme at the end of October which very likely, even if the Bill were re-committed by the House, would not be approved of upstairs. He might be allowed to say a word or two on a point germane to the question now before the House. They were dealing in connection with underground locomotion in London, one of the most important social questions of the day in the Metropolis, because the solution of the locomotion question was closely wrapped up with many of the gravest and most important social problems. A Joint Committee examined this question of underground traction in 1901, and since that time cart-loads of Bills had been introduced. No fewer than twenty-six Bills dealing with tubular schemes had been introduced into Parliament this session. They represented eighty-six miles of tubes in the Metropolis, and after all the labours of the Committees of the House of Lords, and of this House, the net result had only been the sanction of four miles in three small extension Bills. He appealed urgently to the President of the Board of Trade, as the Minister responsible for this department of traction service, to take up a vigorous attitude on the question that would obviate some of the difficulties which they had had. During the past session two Committees of the House of Lords and of this House had been appointed to deal with different sets of Bills for tubular lines. There had been no communication between the two Committees, and the result had been that the Bills had been examined on their individual merits, and had not been investigated as a general scheme. He trusted that the whole of this work in regard to London locomotion would be investigated by one general expert Committee.

*MR. SPEAKER said that the hon. Member was going into a question which was not raised by this particular Bill.

*SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER said he apologised, but he asked his right hon. friend to consider this point in view of the future, because they had not yet solved the question of London locomotion. In conclusion he would say that, looking at the matter from every point of view, it was the bounden duty of the House not to listen to the re-committal of the Bill.

(10.5.) MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) said that, as Chairman of the District Railway, he would not vote in a division if it were taken, but having a special knowledge of the subject under discussion he might be permitted to refer to one or two points affecting the railways concerned, in consequence of the statements made by the hon. Gentleman opposite. In the first place, the District Company had no control whatever over the Brompton and Piccadilly Railway, the Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway the Great Northern and Strand Railway and the Baker Street-Waterloo line. The only connection between these undertakings was that certain parties holding a large interest in the District Railway were also the chief proprietors in the four railways he had named. So far as regards the travelling public of London they were anxious to work these railways in unison, and to avoid the very thing which had been pointed out by the hon. Member for Shoreditch as a disadvantage. The effect of these railways being practically under one control, and working in alliance, was that money which otherwise would be spent in duplicating railways would now be saved. For example, the capital of such a railway as that from Charing Cross to Victoria could be saved, and usefully expended in providing accommodation in other parts of London, where at present there was no adequate provision of communication. He would like to correct his hon. friend the Member for Luton in his statement that nothing had been done with reference to the Brompton and Piccadilly Railway and allied lines. That was an absolute and unpardonable error. All the four railways were being rapidly pushed on, and one of them had been in active progress for more than a year. Upwards of a million had been expended on them, the contracts were let, and the land notices had all been served. It was a mistake for his hon. friend to say that these railways were block lines, or were promoted as such.

MR. ASHTON said if he had stated that nothing had been done on the Brompton and Piccadilly Railway he certainly did make an incorrect statement, because he was aware that the notices had already been served. What he meant to say was that nothing had been done until quite recent times, which, he believed, was a correct statement.

*MR. PERKS said that his hon. friend must know that it was a very common thing indeed for a railway company to have statutory powers for two, three, or even four years before it saw fit to exercise them and to start work. Such indeed was the case with the Central London Railway. If the Motion was adopted it would tie the hands of the Committee, and would serve very little the purposes of the promoters. Both on the question of procedure, and of fairness to the other railway companies, he hoped the House would not listen to the proposal to re-commit the Bill. It was perfectly true that as a result of the withdrawal of the Tramway Company's Railway Bill and the acquisition of a large interest in the Tramways Company by parties interested in the District Railway and allied lines, new relations of great public importance were opened up between the District Railway Company and the tramways in the West of London. But that was a great advantage to the public as well as to the proprietors of both the Tramways and the Railway Company. It obviated the unnecessary duplication of capital, and it provided the immediate securing of through rates between the tramways and the railways by routes which otherwise would not have been available to the travelling public for some years to come. It was also important that the House should know that it was the intention of the District Railway Company, acting in unison with some of the other companies, to submit to Parliament next session a scheme which would give a second route from Hammersmith to the City. This would involve an expenditure, not of six or seven millions sterling, but of one and a half million or thereabouts, and would accomplish all the results of the more costly scheme. He would say nothing at all with reference to the reflections which had been passed on the District Railway Company, except that they were now in the midst of the work of converting the much-abused District Railway into an electric railway, and, for this purpose, they had raised two and a half millions. It would be running as an electric railway fifteen months hence, while six miles would be open at the end of January next. It would, therefore, be extremely hard to allow a competing route to come into the field under these new conditions until the existing and authorised companies had proved inefficient.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith) said that the promoters of the Bill came and asked Parliament to do something which he would not say was unprecedented, but was unusual. When a Committee upstairs had found the preamble of a Bill not proved, it was a very unusual thing to re-commit that Bill. He said it was not unprecedented because it had been done in the early part of this session, but the promoters had to make out a very strong case for the adoption of that course. Could it be said that in the present case the promoters had made out a strong case? [Cries of "No."] He was extremely sorry for the promoters, because if he might express his own private opinion he thought that they had been very badly used. But not by the House of Commons or by Parliament. Their enemies were of their own household.

The House of Commons had nothing to blame themselves for, or to reproach themselves with. The Committee had done the only thing they possibly could do, bearing in mind the instruction they had got from this House. He thought that the union of the two schemes had been forced on the promoters by the other House, but for reasons which he need not go into they were unable to carry the whole scheme out. That being so, whatever sympathy they might feel for the promoters, he did not think that the House could be fairly asked now to recommit the Bill. He felt that there would be great difficulty in making the passage of this Bill dependent on the passage of the other Bill; and, for all these reasons he thought it would be impossible to ask the House to recommit the Bill. He gave that advice to the House with great regret, because it meant that the solution of the great difficulty of London traffic would be once more delayed; and also because next session they would have to go through again all that mass of work which had been imposed on the Committee, and would again have to wade through all these schemes in order to find the best scheme. It was, therefore, with extreme regret that he asked the House not to accept the Motion.

MR. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said there was one point of view in favour of the Motion which had not yet been put to the House. A great many people in the East End of London were anxious that the Bill should go through. They looked upon it, not from the point of view of the promoters at all, but from the point of view of the traffic of London. The scheme formed part of the through route through London, and there was no reason why it should not be welded on to another scheme, which would satisfy the whole of London. He had been requested by the Borough Councils of Hackney and Stoke Newington to lay that view before the House.

*SIR LEWIS M'IVER (Edinburgh, W.) said the discussion had been so ably dealt with by hon. Members, that he felt that the customary speech from the Chairman of the Committee was practically supererogatory. As it would be his bounden duty to reconsider the Bill if it were recommitted, he would speak on the Motion with great restraint. There were two points which he wished to put before the House. Speaking as a private Member he thought that, having regard to the very unsavoury details of the transaction, a scandal which had probably no precedent in the annals of their committee work upstairs, it behoved the House to take care that there was no suspicion upon it of taking any part in such a quarrel. As the Chairman of the Committee, he thought that if this Motion were passed there would be infinite difficulty in giving effect to the wishes of the House. With the greatest sympathy with this big scheme, which had been wrecked by a Stock Exchange ramp, with the feeling that the House should not allow the public interest to be made a counter in a game of this sort—for it was a game in which it was proposed to make the London roads pawns on the chequer board of Wall Street—and with sympathy with the people who were wronged and who ought to have had more sense than to be associated with people who could wrong them in such a manner, it seemed to him that they would not be able within the rules of the House to satisfy the laudable desires of the hon. Member who had fairly and correctly stated the case to the House. Speaking again as a private Member, he advocated the relegation of the whole matter to next session, when they could start with a clean slate, remembering that when two of a trade fell out perhaps the London County Council might come by its own.

MR. ASHTON said that after the opinion which had been expressed by the Chairman of Committees, and also by the Chairman of Committee, he would ask leave to withdraw the Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

(10.39.) MR. WHITLEY said the Amendment he desired to move had reference to the removal of foundation managers for certain reasons. The First Lord of the Treasury, at an earlier stage, had indicated that there would be no power to remove these managers. He thought that the Committee would agree with him that power ought to be given to the local authority or to the Education Department to remove managers who failed to carry out the conditions under which the voluntary schools had been placed on public funds, and who deliberately overstepped the authority given to them under the Act. The Committee was well acquainted with the working or non-working of the Conscience Clause; and what his Amendment asked was that the children and their parents should be protected from the possibility of managers evading the Conscience Clause by entering the schools at hours other than the hours allocated to religious instruction, and at a time when the children could not be withdrawn under the Conscience Clause acting in a manner which was really contrary to the protection given by Parliament to the children of Nonconformists under the Conscience Clause. The Prime Minister, on a former occasion, asked him not to tell any more blood curdling stories, and in order to save the right hon. Gentleman's feeling, he would put the kind of action to which he referred in a form which the Committee would recognise as of frequent occurrence. A manager might enter the school during the course of the ordinary lessons, and call on the children to attend a religious service in the church. That was not an infrequent, and was, in fact, a growing practice. He had no objection to the managers taking the children of their own denomination to church or chapel during the time devoted to religious instruction; but he had a great objection to the children of Nonconformists being marched from school to a service with which their parents entirely disagreed. What he asked for was that the power of the managers in connection with religious questions should be confined to the hours for religious instruction stated on the time table; and that if a manager went into a school during any other hours and instructed the children on religious matters, it should be regarded as an infraction of duty, and the local authority should have power to remove any manager against whom such a charge had been proved. If the Committee looked with favour on the Amendment, he would be prepared to modify it, and to insert a right of appeal to the Board of Education, which ought to meet any reasonable objection. The Amendment would prevent an injustice to the children of Nonconformists; it would be no hardship on the managers; and would not interfere with religious instruction.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 20, at end, insert, '(*e*) The local education authority shall have the right of removing any manager, who, at any time other than that allocated in the timetable of the school for religious instruction, shall question or instruct the scholars on any matter of religious doctrine or observance.'"—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he thought he would be able to prove to the hon. Gentleman that his Amendment was unnecessary. A day did not consist of more than twenty-four hours, and would be divided up into the hours for religious instruction, the hours in which primary education was given, and the residue. As regarded the residue, the hon. Gentleman did not wish the Committee to interfere, or to lay down that no manager should talk to a scholar on any subject he pleased during it; neither did the hon. Gentleman wish to interfere with the hours to be given up to religious instruction; and there remained, therefore, only the hours which were to be given up to secular instruction. He would remind the hon. Gentleman that during those hours the local education authority would have absolute control over everything that went on in the school. A manager would have no more power to take children away from school during the hours of secular instruction to a church or chapel than he would have to regulate the proceedings of this House. Therefore, the hon. Member would feel that the difficulty which he thought now existed, and which he himself was not prepared to deny did occasionally arise, would be removed under the Bill, without the Amendment.

MR. WHITLEY said he quite agreed that the local authority would have control during the hours of secular instruction, but this Amendment would provide a penalty not now in the Bill. Where was the remedy for dealing with managers who acted in the way the Amendment indicated?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said such action would be forbidden. If the recommendations of the local authority were disobeyed, the school would cease to be maintained; the teacher who permitted action contrary to such recommendations would be dismissed; and nothing else short of the regiment of soldiers could be suggested to meet the views of the hon. Gentleman.

MR. WHITLEY said there was a very simple remedy, namely, the removal of the manager who offended.

Question put and negatived.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The Amendment standing in the name of the hon. member for East Somerset is not in order on this Clause, for this reason. The Clause we are now dealing with relates to the maintenance of non-provided schools. His proposal really relates to a mutual arrangement for maintaining a school as a provided school. The next two Amendments standing in the name of the Member for the Morley Division are out of order for the same reason.

MR. M'KENNA said he handed in an Amendment at the Table to sub-Clause (*d*) which he thought should have precedence over the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Morley Division, which would be a new sub-Clause.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY asked if sub-Clause (*d*) had not been disposed of, and would the Amendment of the hon. Member be, therefore, in order.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member was quite right. The Amendment could not now be moved.

MR. BRYCE asked if the Amendment of the hon. Member which had been ruled out of order would not be in the nature of a positive enactment.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The beginning of the Clause is that the local education authority are to maintain non-provided schools on certain provisions and conditions. The Amendment is hardly a provision or condition which can regulate the maintenance or non-maintenance of non-provided schools. It is a separate proposal, which, of course, can very probably be made in the proper place. This also applies to the next Amendment in the name of the hon. Member for East Denbighshire.

DR. MACNAMARA said the Amendment he wished to move dealt with the small matter of practical administration, namely the question of the wear and tear of furniture and the putting of the premises in proper order, if used outside school hours. The Amendment on the Paper was substantially agreed to by the Secretary to the Board of Education and himself, after the Government had agreed to the substance of his original proposal. The previous night, however, the Prime Minister agreed to give to the local authority the right to use the premises rent free for three nights a week. That being so, he asked permission to recast the Amendment on the Paper, and move it in a form which would meet the altered condition, arising from the Prime Minister's Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 20, at the end, to insert the words 'the managers of a school not provided by the local education authority in respect of the use by them of the school furniture out of school hours, and the local education authority in respect of the use by them of any room in the school out of school hours, shall be liable to make good any damage caused to the furniture or the room, as the case may be, by reason of that use other damage arising from fair wear and tear, and the managers shall take care that after the use of a room in the school by them, the room is left in a proper condition for school purposes.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. M'KENNA said the Amendment was one to which the Committee ought not to be asked to agree. They were asked to permit the managers to use the furniture supplied by the local authority without being liable for fair wear and tear. It could not be suggested that the local authority were to provide furniture for Sunday schools. If the Amendment were accepted, it would be admitting a right on the part of the managers to use the furniture supplied by the local authority; and it was hardly reasonable to ask the Committee to hand over to the managers the plant supplied by the local authority without entitling the local authority to charge for fair wear and tear.

MR. LOUGH said he thought the Government were labouring under some mistake. The Clause provided that payment was to be made for fair wear and tear, but the whole sense of that provision was reversed in the Amendment, which was perfectly absurd in the form in which it was put before the Committee, and which should therefore be restored to the form in which it appeared on the Paper.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he thought that the Amendment was a reasonable one. The hon. Member who had just spoken thought that the Government had committed themselves to the phrase in the original Amendment, which would make it necessary for the managers to pay for the wear and tear of the furniture of the schools. They had never committed themselves to anything of the kind. It was not made impossible under this Amendment for the local authority if they chose, after school hours, to remove their furniture, though every one knew that they would keep it in the schools. It would be futile to suggest, as a practical policy, that the local authority should remove the furniture every afternoon after school hours, and put it back every morning before school hours. But the suggestion was that, if they left it in the school, it might not be altogether desirable from the point of view of the managers of the school. It was a great illusion to suppose that furniture which was most convenient for elementary education was necessarily convenient for every purpose to which the school-house was put. According to the hon. Member for North Camberwell, dancing sometimes took place in the schools, and if the school was to be used for dancing nothing could be more inconvenient than desks and benches. But apart from dancing, meetings of various kinds, such as bazaars, were held; and the furniture of the education authority might then be found to be merely a nuisance. On the other hand, there was a certain amount of wear and tear by the education authority during school hours of the school buildings, and the Government thought it fair that the two things should be set off one against the other. It would be absurd to try to estimate the annual amount of damages to be paid for the use of the furniture. That would be neither equitable in abstract theory nor practicable in the ordinary work of life. For these reasons the Amendment could not be adopted.

(10.55) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he regretted that the Amendment had been moved by his hon. friend in an altered form. In order to raise the matter in its original form he would move, as an Amendment, to leave out all the words after "provided" and to insert "if they make use of any room, etc.," down to the end of the Amendment on the Paper. The right hon. Gentleman suggested that as the managers gave to the local education authority the school buildings during ordinary school hours free of charge, it was a fair set-off that the local authority should give the managers the use of the furniture during non-school hours. What became of the other bargain if that were to be the set-off? He understood that the bargain was that the managers were to get their own teachers and have their own denomination taught, and only pay about 5s. a week as against 55s. to be paid by the local education authority. Now a new bargain was imposed which he thought was unfair. The Prime Minister suggested that it was possible that the school furniture would not be convenient for school purposes. Everyone knew that it would be the very thing that would be wanted for, for instance, Sunday schools. That development with regard to the furniture was a new revelation. Today they discovered, for the first time, that the intention of the Government was that the old furniture should be purchased by the local authority, although the Government had, after a great deal of pressure, promised to reconsider that proposal. At any rate, in future it was distinctly understood that the local authority was to find all the new appliances that might be required, and that the managers were to be at liberty to use them for their own denominational purposes without any charge. The Attorney General said that afternoon that the charge for the furniture would be a matter of arrangement between the managers and the local authority; but the Amendment changed all that and gave the managers a legal right to use the furniture without payment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said not if the education authority chose to remove it.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that that was really such an impossible suggestion that he would put it out of the purview of the discussion. It was too preposterous even for a Parliamentary discussion. He was not even sure that the local authority could remove the furniture, because, if the Amendment were passed, the managers would be entitled to argue that there was a provision in the Act as to the manner in which the furniture could be used by them. He thought it was perfectly clear that the managers would have a legal right; but, in any event, unless the furniture were removed, it would be perfectly clear under the Amendment that as long as the managers did not break the furniture, they could use it without making any payment for it. It was becoming clearer and clearer that the Bill was designed entirely in the interests of the Church, and not in the interests of education. The cost of providing new appliances and furniture would fall on the local authority, and that change would be entirely in the interests of the Church, as the present appliances were distinctly inferior. Every alteration that had been made in the Bill, notwithstanding apparent concessions, was in the interests of the Church.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out from the first word 'authority' to the end of the proposed Amendment, and insert the words 'if they make use of any room in the school-house out of school hours, shall be liable, if required, to make a reasonable payment to the local education authority in respect of wear and tear of, or damage to, any school furniture belonging to the local education authority resulting from that use, and shall take care that after any such use the room is left in a proper condition for school purposes.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not press his Amendment. The hon. Gentleman put it as if the use of the furniture were to be enjoyed by the managers as a set-off against giving the use of the school buildings for educational purposes during school hours. That was not the question at all. The hon. Gentleman entirely forgot that the managers would be entitled to the full use of the buildings out of school hours were it not for the provision introduced yesterday which provided that the local authority should have the right to use the buildings three nights a week if required for the purposes of education. That was a cardinal fact in connection with the Amendment. The managers had given up the use of the buildings for three nights a week, and as against that, they were now to have the use of the furniture, if the local authority chose to leave it in the school, during the remaining evenings in the week. Was it not reasonable and business-like to set off one against the other, and say that in neither case would wear and tear be taken into account? If the local authority conducted their business in a disorderly manner, and if the scholars smashed the windows, their damage would have to be made good. On the other hand, if the managers conducted their meetings in such a manner as resulted in the furniture being smashed, they would have to pay compensation; but neither party need trouble about fair wear and tear. The matter seemed quite simple when one realised what the conditions were; and he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not press his Amendment.

Mr. BRYCE said that if he understood the position of the Government, they had completely forgotten what they had said three months ago was the main object of the Bill—namely, the establishment of one authority. Apparently now there were to be two authorities, and the local education authority was to be entirely different when it was dealing with elementary education from what it was when dealing with secondary education. For the education authority to be thus divided into an elementary and a secondary authority was quite inconsistent with the alleged principle of the Bill.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said that was not the case. All they had done was to put the buildings during school hours at the disposal of the local education authority, and then, in addition, the managers were to give the use of the school for education purposes on three evenings in the week. There was no division of the authority. If damage was done during that evening instruction the authority ought to give compensation.

Mr. BRYCE said that originally the authority, being one authority for educational purposes, was to get the use of the buildings free for all such purposes, but this attempt to sever elementary from secondary education——

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: There is no such division.

Mr. BRYCE said it seemed to him that the education authority *qua* secondary education authority was to make a payment or give a consideration for the use of the buildings and furniture which he had understood it was to receive as a matter of course as a part of the general bargain.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS contended that the effect of the Amendment had been entirely changed. The hon. Member for North Camberwell seemed to have swallowed his own proposal, and accepted a provision of the Government which would place on the local authority an additional obligation.

Dr. MACNAMARA explained that since he placed his Amendment on the Paper, a new engagement had been entered into under which the local authority were to get the free use of the school on three nights in the week. That, he thought, had modified the situation.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS said that that concession was made because everybody considered that the schools should be devoted to educational purposes. It was never intended that the bargain should, in consequence, be varied in another respect so as to make the local authority pay for the use of the room. The Committee had already decided that the repair of the school was an obligation on the managers, but by this Amendment the repair of a room—which might mean the repair of every room in the school—was to be undertaken by the local authority.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: If they damage the room.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said repairs only became necessary if a room was damaged. He should certainly vote for his hon. friend's Amendment.

MR. PYM said the whole discussion was on the commonest of common subjects, viz., the value of the depreciation of furniture by wear and tear. It was really a matter with which Parliament ought not to deal at all. The question of wear and tear would not arise for some time, and surely it would be much better to leave such petty questions to be arranged between the local authority and the managers as and when they arose.

MR. LOUGH, who spoke amid continued cries of "Divide," was understood to complain that the arguments of the Prime Minister were inconsistent with those of the Attorney General in this matter.

(11.23.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question, 'That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 193; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 438.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Charles William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt, Hon. Sir William Hart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants. W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Agustus Frederick
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon

Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (Bury S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David. J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyn'side
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York E. R.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randall
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York W. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr M'Kenna and Mr. Trevelyan.

(11.38.) Question put accordingly "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 198; Noes, 68. (Division List No. 439.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Col. James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, SirJohnCharlesReady
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, SirHoratioD. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFr'dDixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnE.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, SirWilliam Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir WilliamHart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants. W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, RtHn. SirJ. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, SirRobert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gore, HnG. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, HenryD. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHnLordG (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. ArthurFred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. SirJohnH.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, SirJoseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. CharlesW, (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ. (Portsmouth
Macartney, RtHnW. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, SirLewis (EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, DavidJ (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, RtHnA. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, HerbertPike (Darlingt'n
Peel, HnWm. RobertWellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederick Carne
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (IsleofWight
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, HC (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, SirMarkJ. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson, DrEC (Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, RtHn. SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald

Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Roland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northant
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Alfred Hutton and Mr. Whitley.

(11.50.) Mr. A. J. BALFOUR claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the proposed words be there inserted' be now put."

Question put accordingly, "That the proposed words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 194; Noes, 65. (Division List No. 440.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Col. James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford Lord Charles William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh'e)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (M'nc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Ed. Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(S'lop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brights'de
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard John (Kent Faversham
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.

Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Pease Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E B. (Isle of Wight
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
M‘Arthur, William (Cornwall)

M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Rea Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants

Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas,J A(GlamorganGower
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W R)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,Sir J T(Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Alfred Hutton and
Mr. Whitley.

It being after Midnight, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the Business.

(12.2.) Mr. A. J. BALFOUR claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the first word "The," in line 21, to the word "managers," in line 24, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the first word "The," in line 21, to the word "managers," in line 24, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 191, Noes, 64. (Division List No. 441.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Frederick George
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, LordCharlesWilliam
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, SirJohn Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, SirHoratioD. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. SirWilliamHart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, RtHnSirJ. (Manch'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS. (WarwickS. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, HnG. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, SirE. W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir William Hy.
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John(Kent, Faversham
Jebb, Sir Richard (Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. SirJohn H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Willam H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. Taunton
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
M‘Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norman, Henry
Rea, Russell
Rickett J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Hudd'rsf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Nussey and Mr. Caldwell.

Question, "That the words of the Clause from the first word 'The,' in line 21, to the word 'managers,' in line 24, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause," put accordingly, and negatived.

The Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 30th October, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

IMPRISONMENT OF A MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following letter relating to the imprisonment of a Member:—

> "The Victoria Hotel,
> "Sligo,
> "29th October, 1902.
>
> "SIR,—I have the honour to inform you that I have this day confirmed the sentence of two resident magistrates on Mr. P. A. M'Hugh, a Member of the House of Commons, which directed him to be imprisoned for criminal conspiracy for two months under the provisions of the Crimes' Act; but I have mitigated the sentence to the extent of not imposing hard labour.
>
> "Mr. M'Hugh refused to enter into a recognisance to the Crown not to publish 'boycotting' or intimidating notices in the journal of which he was the proprietor, the *Sligo Champion.*
>
> "I have the honour to be, Sir,
> "Your obedient servant,
> "WM. O'CONNOR MORRIS,
> "County Court Judge and Chairman of
> "Quarter Sessions."

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Bristol; Halstead; Braintree; Maldon; and Witham; to lie upon the Table.

CHHIDI.

Petition from Cawnpore, for the release of Chhidi, a convict; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Lidlington; Houghton Conquest; Fivehead; and Bridgwater (four); to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Braintree; Witham; Halstead; Maldon; and Bristol; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Liverpool; and St. Helens; to lie upon the Table.

JAMMADAS, JOSHI.

Petition of the widow of Joshi Jammadas, for the redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

KOOSAJI.

Petitions of Sampat, son of Koosaji, for redress of grievance; to lie upon the Table.

PADAYACHI VEERABADRA.

Petition of Veerabadra Padayachi, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE (EXTENSION TO WOMEN) BILL.

Petition from North Brierley, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: from Bristol; Witham; Halstead; Braintree; and Maldon; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SUPERANNUATION.

Copy ordered, "of Treasury Minute, dated the 24th day of June, 1902, as to the pension to be awarded to Mr. G. R. Price, Registrar in the Chancery Division of the Supreme Court of Judicature, Ireland, on his retirement."—(*Mr. Hayes Fisher.*)

LOCAL RECORDS COMMITTEE.

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed to inquire as to the existing arrangements for the collection and custody of local records, and as to further measures which it may be advisable to take for the purpose [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of statement under administrative counties and county boroughs of public elementary schools which have received building grants, showing in each case the amount of such building grants, and the amount subscribed by the promoters at the time (so far as records exist); also, in the case of schools which have been transferred to the School Board or closed, the year of transfer or closure, with explanatory memorandum and appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of precedents of trust deeds settled for Church of England Schools, British Schools, Established Church of Scotland Schools, Wesleyan Schools, Free Church (Scotland) Schools, Roman Catholic Schools, Jewish Schools Episcopal Church (Scotland) Schools, and Undenominational Schools referred to in the Revised Code of 1870 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SHIPS COMMISSIONED (CHATHAM, PORTSMOUTH, AND DEVONPORT).

Return presented relative thereto, [ordered 24 July; Mr. Reginald Lucas]; to lie upon the Table; and to be printed [No 363.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

India—Special Irrigation Grants.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) To ask the Secretary of State for India, in view of the fact that the Government of India had sanctioned a special irrigation grant of 25 lakhs (£166,666, 13s. 4d.) to local governments for minor works such as village wells, tanks, and channels, is he yet in a position to state how much of this sum will be allocated to each province.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) The special irrigation grant has been distributed as follows: Rajputana, Rs. 60,000; Coorg, Rs. 5,000; Punjab, Rs. 6,14,000; Bombay, Rs. 2,00,000; Sind, Rs. 7,20,000; North West Frontier Province, Rs. 1,65,000; Madras, Rs. 4,00,000; North West Provinces and Oudh, Rs. 50,000; Bengal, Rs. 20,000; Baluchistan, Rs. 60,000; Central Provinces, Rs. 2,00,000.

China Operations, 1900—Sale of Surplus — Stores of Rum.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that on 20th September last the chief supply and transport officer at Tientsin sold, by public tender, 5,540 gallons of rum, part of the surplus stores of the British contingent; and will he state to whom was this rum sold, for what purpose was it originally placed in store, and is it now the rule to supply spirits to British soldiers in the field.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) No report has been received from the general officer commanding the China force as to the sale of the rum referred to. A small daily issue of rum to men on active service is permitted by the regulations, at the discretion of the general officer commanding, on the recommendation of the medical officer.

Army Medical Corps in India—Pay.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state when the increase of pay promised several months ago to the captains and subalterns of the Royal Army Medical Corps serving in India will be granted; the amount of the increase in rupees; and from what date will the increase count.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) An increase in the pay of officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps below the rank of major, while serving in India, has been approved in principle, but the amount of increase is still under the consideration of the Government of India, who have been asked to telegraph their views as soon as they have arrived at them.

Proposed Fishing Harbour at Swordle, Lewis.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate if the Congested Districts Board will again consider the expediency of providing a grant in aid of the construction of a harbour at Swordle, Island of Lewis; and will he state on what ground this assistance has hitherto been refused.

(*Answered by Mr. Graham Murray.*) Assistance has been refused on the ground that Swordle is only distant three miles from Stornoway and about two miles from Bayble, to which the Board have quite recently granted £1,640 towards a pier, and the Board have not hitherto felt justified in aiding works in such close proximity to each other.

Evening Continuation Classes Grant.

SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire): To ask the Lord Advocate if he will state the reason why the reports and grants to the evening continuation classes of 1901–02 have not been sent out, although the school year ended on 31st

July last; and, in view of the inconvenience caused to the managers by this delay, can he state when the schools are likely to receive the reports and grants.

(*Answered by Mr. Graham Murray.*) More than one-third of the claims for grants to the continuation classes have already been paid, and the remainder are being dealt with as rapidly as possible. In the majority of cases it has been found necessary to refer back to the managers the forms of claim for grant, for more complete particulars or for corrected returns, before the calculation of the grant could be proceeded with. Every effort is being made to complete the payment of all the claims, but even now some managers have not yet submitted their returns in the first instance for the consideration of the Department.

Employment in Government Departments of Discharged Soldiers and Sailors.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will issue an order to all Government Departments to carry out the expressed wishes of the House of Commons and the recommendations of Select Committees that no messenger or other officer in that category is to be appointed unless he has served in the Army, Navy, or auxiliary forces in the field.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) The Treasury has no power to require all Government Departments to exclude from their employment as messengers and officers of that category all persons except those who have served in the Army, Navy, or auxiliary forces. The Treasury have, by Minute of 14th March, 1894, provided for the employment of a certain number of Army and Navy pensioners in the Departments under their control, and they understand that other public offices give a preference to men who have served, for all suitable employment.

Education Bill—School Teachers' Superannuation.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, in the event of the new Board of Managers getting rid of a teacher on account of age, provision will be made that he should not lose any benefit under the School Teachers' Superannuation Act.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) It is not proposed to insert in the Education Bill such a provision as the hon. Member suggests. The case of a teacher who has become permanently incapable, owing to infirmity of mind or body, of being an efficient teacher in a public elementary school is provided for by Section 2 of the Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act.

National Society's Schools.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): To ask Mr. Attorney General what are the trusts relating to religious teaching upon which the elementary schools in connection with the National Society are held; and whether there are any provisions requiring that such religious teaching is to be controlled by any specific authority.

(*Answered by Sir Robert Finlay.*) The trust deeds of schools connected with the National Society are varied in their character. A Return setting forth the earlier forms of such deeds has been already asked for and granted; the sheets are now with the printer, and it is hoped that they will be in the possession of the House in a few days. I find that the more recent forms of trust deeds employed since the cessation of building grants are not within the knowledge of the Board of Education, but they could no doubt be obtained from the National Society. It would not be possible within the ordinary compass of an Answer to set out accurately the various provisions of these trust deeds on the heads referred to in the Question.

Bushey Park.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): To ask the hon. Member for North Hunts whether he will explain why the Office of Works has parted with a portion of Bushey Park to the United Tramways Company, Limited; and seeing that land needed to widen the road for a tramway might have been purchased by the Company on the opposite side of it, he will state whether the strip of Bushey Park was sold to the Company for a price equivalent to that which the Company would have had to pay for the same accommodation on the other side of the road.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) There has been no sale of land to the

United Tramways Company. The Office of Works is, however, disposed to entertain a proposal, which is strongly supported by the local authorities, for setting back the fence of Bushey Park for some distance along the tramway line where the road would be dangerously narrow. A piece of timbered land, of larger area than that to be thrown into the roadway, would be added to the Park free of charge, a substantial permanent fence would be erected along the new frontage line of the Park, and all structures would be reinstated free of expense to the Crown. There are various precedents for the widening of roads skirting the Royal Parks, to meet the wishes of the local authorities for the safety of the public.

Irish Postmasterships—Appointment of Englishmen and Scotchmen.

Dr. THOMPSON: To ask the Postmaster General whether he will explain why the office of postmaster in the following Irish towns, viz.: Ballinasloe, Buttevant, Kilmallock, Kilrush, Kingstown, Lisburn, Londonderry, Newbridge, Roscrea, and Youghall has been recently filled by importations of English and Scotch postmasters to Ireland; and whether he will take steps to discontinue this system in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) These offices were filled by the appointment of the most suitable candidates. I have no information as to the nationality of any of the officers selected, and I see no reason for departing from the present method of selection.

Kilmallock (Limerick) Labourers' Cottages Scheme.

Mr. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that under the scheme in course of operation under the Labourers' Act in the Kilmallock District Council, County Limerick, a cottage and plot designed on the farm of Patrick Hayes, of Oldtown, Hospital, farmer, for Michael Hayes, agricultural labourer, were passed at the inquiry in Kilmallock, but that afterwards the engineer of the council mapped the site at the other side of the fence on the farm of a man named Thomas Murphy, and that when the engineer went to rectify the mistake Patrick Hayes would not allow him to enter on his land; and will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to remedy the matter as soon as possible

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Local Government Board has no information as to the alleged refusal of the occupier to allow entry on his lands, but if he has so refused and the District Council has obtained the requisite certificate from the justices, under Section 7 of the 8 Vict., cap. 20, the Council should place the matter in the hands of its solicitor.

Employment of Discharged Soldiers.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the advisability of appointing a small committee with an office in a central situation to endeavour, by communication with various parts of the country, to obtain employment for deserving men from the Front who have left, or are about to leave, the colours, and, in the meantime, to assist the meritorious by such means as can be placed in their power.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The National Society for the Employment of Reserve Men and Discharged Soldiers has been, and is now engaged in this important work. This Society is supported by contributions from Army funds. The office is being removed to a more commodious and central position in Victoria Street. It would not, therefore, appear desirable to take the organisation out of the hands of the Society, as suggested in the Question.

Contracts for Canteens.

Mr. MOUNT (Berkshire, Newbury): To ask the Secretary of State for War, having regard to the fact that the Army order dealing with contracts for regimental institutes expires on the 31st December, and in view of the uncertainty as regards the future conduct of regimental institutes, causing inconvenience both to officers commanding regiments and to traders, whether he will state when the Report on canteens will be made public

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I am not yet in a position to make any statement on this matter, as the Report has only just reached me.

Volunteer and Militia Statistics.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the present number of effectives in the Volunteer forces, and the present strength of the Militia.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The strength of the Militia on the 1st October, exclusive of officers and permanent staff, was 104,380. The number of effective Volunteers on the 1st October was 272,957.

South Africa—Outfit Allowances to Militia Officers.

MAJOR RASCH: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether militia officers who went to South Africa with their own units will be granted the same outfit allowance of £100 as those who left their regiments and served with remounts and other corps.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Militia officers attached to units other than their own were found to have incurred special expenditure for uniform and outfit. They were consequently given an allowance which was not given to officers serving with their own corps.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

Settlement of South Africa.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if, with a view to encourage organised immigration of settlers in the Transvaal and Orange Free State and other parts of South Africa, the Government will consider the advisability of establishing an office or Department of immigration under the control of the Colonial Office to co-operate with the Departments of immigration in the various colonies.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In answer to my hon. friend I have to say that we are not yet in a position to encourage organised immigration into South Africa. For the present, it seems, the supply of agricultural settlers on the spot is as great as can conveniently be absorbed. Lord Milner will be consulted as to whether he thinks any such steps as my hon. friend suggests could be taken, and how soon they could be taken.

Somaliland.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Have the Government any further communication with reference to the Somali War?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): We have heard that Colonel Swayne has reached the coast at Berbera, leaving Colonel Cobbe in command at Bohotle. The garrison there is perfectly safe, and the guns have arrived. We have also heard that the wounded are doing very well.

Royal Naval Reserve.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, with a view to encourage British seamen to enrol in the Royal Naval Reserve, arrangements can be made which will admit of Royal Naval Reserve men performing their annual drill at any naval station abroad.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): Since 1891 arrangements have been in force for the drilling of a number of men in the Royal Naval Reserve serving abroad, who are unable to return to this country. The number of men, however, who have availed themselves of the privilege has been small. Only 102 men have been drilled at the outstations during a period of six years. Every facility is given to reserve men to perform their drills in advance of time if they are likely to be long from the United Kingdom. They are also permitted to perform arrears of drill on their return. It is not believed that by adding to the facilities for drilling abroad the number of Royal Naval Reserve men would be increased.

Cruisers to Cope with Foreign Armoured Commerce Destroyers.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether there are now under construction or whether it is proposed to construct any cruisers of the "Drake" type capable of coping with the fastest and most heavily armoured commerce destroyers of foreign navies, such as the Russian cruiser "Novik," which steams twenty-five knots.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I think the hon. Member is under a misapprehension. The Russian ship "Novik" is not one of the fastest and most heavily armoured commerce destroyers, but is a second-class cruiser of 3,000 tons displacement. Vessels of the "Drake" class are fully capable of coping with such a ship. None of the so-called commerce destroyers of foreign navies possess a speed of twenty-five knots.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Has the "Novik" a speed of twenty-five knots?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: She is only a small second-class cruiser and not a commerce destroyer.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Has the Admiralty any vessels under construction which will be able to cope with her?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Admiralty is under the impression that the vessels of the "Drake" class are fully capable of that.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the "Novik" cannot steam twenty-five knots for more than four hours?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I have every reason to believe that the hon. Member is quite correct.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Can the hon. Gentleman explain what is to be understood by the term "commerce destroyer"?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I was only using a term which is generally used by more than one of the Great Powers in regard to large, unarmoured cruisers built by them.

German Locomotives for Indian Railways.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that in an order for locomotives, placed by the East Indian Railway in 1901, completion of which was to have been effected by August, 1902, the Chairman of the railway stated that the Company would save thirty-nine weeks by accepting a German tender as opposed to a British tender; whether he is aware that the contract period for the German locomotives expired in August, 1902, that none were delivered in August or September, and that the order is not expected to be completed until the end of the year; and whether, under these circumstances, he will see his way to advise State-supported Indian railways to accept British tenders.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have no knowledge that the Chairman of the East Indian Railway Company made the statement attributed to him in this question, but, otherwise, I believe that the facts are as stated in the Question. But while I wish to do all I legitimately can to help British industries, I cannot undertake to interfere in the manner suggested with the policy of the directors of guaranteed companies, who are responsible to their shareholders for the conduct of their business.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: Is the noble Lord aware that the German locomotives which have been supplied to the Indian Government have soft cylinders and cannot run for any long time without becoming useless?

LORD G. HAMILTON: I am not aware that these locomotives have as yet been supplied; I understand that the cause of the delay alluded to is that they have been subjected to precisely the same conditions of test as British locomotives.

Christiania Fishery Conference.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in view of the fact that at the meeting of the Fishery Conference at Christiania in 1901, a resolution was carried in favour of areas such as the Moray Firth being closed against trawlers of all nationalities, will he state whether the signatories to the North Sea Convention have been communicated with on the subject; and, if so, with what result.

LORD CRANBORNE: The Christiania resolution was not couched in any such absolute terms as would appear from the hon. Member's Question. No negotiations have passed on the subject.

MR. WEIR: Is not the noble Lord aware that the Conference sat specially for the purpose of inquiring into illegal trawling round our coasts? Will he make further inquiries?

LORD CRANBORNE: I will inquire into any Question the hon. Gentleman puts on the Paper.

Hong Kong Cable.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Postmaster General, whether he can instruct the Government of Hong Kong to make it publicly known that landing rights will forthwith be granted to any individual or company seeking for them in Hong Kong and its dependencies, under reasonable conditions, for purposes of laying cables.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The Question should have been addressed to the Colonial Office. In the absence of my right hon. friend I will read his answer:—"The instruction suggested by the hon. Member cannot be given to the Governor of Hong Kong, in view of the terms of an agreement made in 1893 with the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company. The full text of the article of the agreement which gives a preferential right to the Company was given by me in answer to a Question in the House on the 8th May, 1899,† to which I would refer the hon. Member."

Boer Generals at Cambridge.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the attitude of persons at a meeting addressed by three Boer commandants at Cambridge last Monday evening; and will steps be taken to prevent the repetition of such scenes of disorder at future meetings of a similar character.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (MR. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St Augustine's): I have obtained reports on this matter from the Cambridge police. The meeting appears to have been orderly; but in the crowd outside the building some disorder occurred, hoots and cheers being mingled, and a few missiles were thrown on to the roof. The police had taken due precautions and, with the exception that a medical man was thrown down and slightly hurt in the excitement when the Speakers were leaving the building, no damage was done to person or property. No action on the part of the Government is called for; the matter is one for the local authorities: and the steps taken by the police appear to have been judicious and effective.

Ventilation of the House of Commons.

MR. WYLIE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury when the Report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the ventilation of the House of Commons building will be issued; and what steps, if any, have been taken during the recess for removing some of the insanitary conditions.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Hunts, Ramsey): The Select Committee is still engaged on its inquiry, and is not expected to issue its further report this session. During the recess the sanitary conveniences behind the division lobbies have been remodelled, and also the Members' lavatory on the Terrace floor.

Dublin Custom House.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that on the pay days of those employed in the Custom House, Dublin, nuns are allowed to cross the barrier and beg for alms; and whether he will take steps to put a stop to the practice.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (MR. WYNDHAM, Dover): I have no information on the matter referred to. If by "barrier" my hon. friend alludes to the chains enclosing the space between the Custom House and the public street, he appears to have overlooked the fact that this space is open to and used by, all classes of the community.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): Will the hon. Member confine his nun and priest hunting to South Belfast?

---

† See (4) *Debates*, lxxi, 53.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. SLOAN: Do I understand from the right hon. Gentleman that there is a public right to this place?

Mr. WYNDHAM: No doubt the public have a right to use it.

Crimes Act Prisoners in Sligo Gaol.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he can state the number of prisoners convicted under The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, who were detained in the local prisons in Sligo, Castlebar, and Mayo for the counties of Leitrim, Roscommon, Sligo, Mayo, Galway, Longford, and Westmeath, respectively, on 24th April last, and the number of such prisoners from these counties in custody in these prisons on Thursday last.

Mr. WYNDHAM: On the 24th April there were five such prisoners in Sligo prison, of whom two were from Sligo, and three from Roscommon. There were no persons in custody on that date from the other counties named, and none at all in custody on Thursday last.

Mr. TULLY: May I as a matter of personal explanation say that I handed to the Clerk at the Table a large bundle of Questions, and they should have been on the Paper that day, but they are missing.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. Member selected Questions put down by other Members, and one Question the hon. Member put down in the name of another hon. Member. That hon. Member stated that he had never seen the Question, and gave no authority for it to be put down.

Mr. TULLY: May I say respectfully, as a matter of personal explanation, that while I was in prison they pirated all my stuff about Sheridan?

Royal Patriotic Commission.

Mr. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Bill promised last session, dealing with the abolition of the Patriotic Commission and the future administration of the funds now controlled by the Royal Patriotic Commissioners, will be introduced and proceeded with this session.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have to express my great regret that the state of public business renders it practically impossible to deal with this matter during the present session.

Mr. KEARLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman introduce the Bill during the present session to see whether it was controversial or not? There was a promise to bring it in this year.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman presses me I shall be prepared to introduce it this session, but I frankly say I have very little hope that I shall be able to proceed further with it.

Voluntary School Trust Deeds Return.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury why the promised copies of precedents of trust deeds of voluntary schools have not been laid upon the Table.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Return to which the hon. Gentleman alludes has turned out to be an extremely voluminous one; the printers have been at work on it night and day, and it will very soon be out of their hands. Of course the information is not Government information; we have had to collect it, as there are no official documents.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: What I asked for were the precedents of voluntary school trust deeds settled by the Education Department. These necessarily are official. As far as I know there are only five or six, and I hope they may be furnished before we conclude the consideration of Clause 8 of the Education Bill.

Sir HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman supply copies of the deed of the National Society, the deed which applies to the great bulk of the denominational schools of England and Wales?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: There are a good many of them.

Sir HENRY FOWLER: There is one model deed. It is contained in a very small pamphlet. I do not think there will be much discussion as to Roman Catholic or Wesleyan deeds, and I think for the purpose of our debates it will be sufficient to give us the deed which applies to the great majority of the denominational schools.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid the matter is not so simple as the right hon. Gentleman seems to suppose, but I will do my best to give him information as soon as it is placed at my disposal.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Surely it would be easy to reprint the trust deed of the National Society published in 1864. There are only four pages of it, and it could be turned out by tomorrow.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Speaking without book, I should think a trust deed as old as 1864 would have had successors. I cannot promise more than that I will do my best.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): What business does the right hon. Gentleman propose to take next week?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I propose during the early part of the week to take the Education Bill at all the Sittings of the House.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.

(2.30.) [Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

*The CHAIRMAN ruled the first four or five Amendments on the Paper out of order, including one in the name of the hon. Member for the Rugby Division of Warwickshire, which he held did not constitute a condition of maintenance.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): Could that not be dealt with in a separate sub-Section.

*The CHAIRMAN: Not on this Clause. It should follow Clause 7. As to the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Elland Division of Yorkshire, the first part, that dealing with the use of the school for political meetings, is in order, but the second is not.

Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said he proposed if it were in order to insert after the word "use" the words "free of charge."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) pointed out, in regard to the hon. Gentleman's Amendment, that its object was to safe-guard the managers—a very different point from that decided on the previous day, which dealt with the damage that might be done either by the local authority or by the managers. His hon. friend proposed that the persons who convened the meeting should pay the managers for any damage that might be done.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) suggested that it might be more convenient to deal with this point on an Amendment which he had further down on the Paper, empowering the local authority to make regulations.

Mr. TREVELYAN said he thought he was quite in order in adding the words "free of charge," and that being so, it seemed to him to be a necessary sequence that provisions should be made, as he proposed in the latter part of his Amendment, for payment to the trustees for any damage done, seeing that the use of the room was to be granted free. The most important part of his Amendment, however, was the proposal to allow meetings to be held in the school in connection with political, municipal, or local elections—to enable them to be held as of right in any school not provided by the local education authority. As the law at present stood, under the Local Government Act, 1894, it was provided that if there were no other place in the village, the school-room should be used free of charge, at all reasonable times, and after reasonable notice, for meetings for the promotion of the candidature of any person for membership of the District or Parish Council. He now proposed to extend that provision to meetings in connection with Parliamentary and municipal elections. In most cases, no doubt, managers of schools would be willing to give every reasonable facility for the holding of meetings, but there were a certain number of cases, especially in county divisions, where the managers, no doubt out of rather stupid political motives, used their right to refuse the use of the school to political opponents. He thought everyone would agree that it was in the interests of the proper discussion of national as well as local politics that at all reasonable times the school should be thrown open to all parties to hold their meetings. His Amendment was confined to granting the use of the school while elections were proceeding, and, therefore, it was calculated to cause the minimum of hardship to the managers. Some, no doubt, might be occasionally inconvenienced by having to surrender the school on an evening on which it had been set apart for some festivity or other event. But if the concession were confined to periods when elections were actually in progress he was sure the hardship would not be at all considerable. There was further down on the Paper an Amendment in the name of the hon. Member for South Down which proposed that the school should be open at all times for political meetings. As far as he was concerned, he was quite ready to extend his proposal in that way, and he thought it might be done if the local authority or some superior body were given a supervising power to make regulations, so that no unreasonable demand should be made which would seriously injure the use of the school for educational purposes. But, as it stood, his Amendment only referred to times when a local or national election was taking place, and, in that form, he did not think it would cast any undue burden upon the managers to give this general right to the public.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, after the words last inserted, to insert the words, '(*f*) The managers of the school shall allow any room in the school to be used, at any time when the school is not being used for public education, for any meeting held in connection with a political, municipal, or local election; and if, by reason of such use of the room, any expenditure is incurred by the managers, or any damage is done to the room, or to any furniture or apparatus in the room, such expense or damage shall be reimbursed to the managers by the persons by whom, or on whose behalf, the meeting is convened.'"—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said the words "free of charge" had played a most important part in connection with the history of that subject. That history was a most interesting one. He gathered that there was to be some opposition to the Amendment from the other side of the House, but he would like to point out that only a few years ago hon. Gentlemen opposite freely accepted a Government Bill to carry out this very object which was embodied in a Resolution unanimously passed by the House of Commons. Certainly the words "free of charge" were not included in that Resolution, but when the Conservative Government of 1892 brought in their Bill they inserted the words. There had been some suggestion that this subject was outside the scope of Public Elementary Education Acts, but he would like to remind the Committee that the Bill to which he had referred was called the Public Elementary Schools Bill of 1892. Clause 3 of that Bill proposed to do exactly what his hon. friend's Amendment suggested. A good many stipulations were put in, and if any importance were attached to them by hon. Members opposite he thought he might say on behalf of his hon. friend that he would be prepared to accept any which would safeguard the rights of the managers, if the Amendment were agreed to. Personally, he thought it would be better to give the educational authority power to make regulations upon this subject. They would thus be able to avoid lengthened debates in the House upon the stipulations, and it certainly seemed to him by far the most satisfactory way of dealing with the subject. The present state of the law in regard to this matter could not be justified at all. If the use of the schools "free of charge" was allowed to one party it certainly should not be refused to another party. As a matter of fact, at present the school-room could be used "free of charge" for all meetings connected with the subject of allotments.

It was also open gratuitously for Parish and District Council elections, but there was no right to use it for municipal or Parliamentary elections. How could they possibly justify such a distinction? If stipulations were required they could put in one making use of the word "reasonable," and that would give an appeal to the Board of Education if anything improper were proposed. There were very considerable debates on this subject at the time of the passing of the Local Government Act, and his right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton would remember that at that time there was some disposition on the part of the Church party in that House, represented by the noble Lord who was now the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, to oppose the words "free of charge." But their arguments were destroyed by the precedent set in the Allotments Act of 1890, and the case for this Amendment was even stronger today than it had ever been before, because more assistance was being given out of the rates to voluntary schools than was afforded at the time at which the debates he referred to occurred. Surely it was monstrous that in, say, a mining community, where rooms were not very easily obtainable, men who were standing for election as members of Parish or District Councils should be able to obtain the use of the school-room "free of charge," while if they sought to obtain election to Borough or County Councils, or to Parliament, it was to be refused to them.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not approach this question from the point of view of abstract or theoretical right. Parliament had thought fit, as to voluntary schools as well as to board schools, to say that they should be used free of charge for certain purposes. It was too late in the day to say—if ever it was proper to say it—that that was absolutely inadmissible. The question was really one of procedure and degree. As regarded procedure, he thought it would be preposterous to make this regulation with regard to voluntary schools, unless it were also made with regard to board schools. This, however, was not the place to make such a regulation with regard to board schools, as the Clause only dealt with non-provided schools. Anything which the House did ought to be done on a general system.

Sir HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): The Act of 1893-94 applied to board schools.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR admitted that, but said that if they were going to extend it it must be done in a provision which itself applied to board schools.

* Sir CHARLES DILKE: The Government Bill of 1892 did not.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he had not the terms of the Bill with him, but he thought the general principle he had laid down should commend itself to common sense. As to the question of substance, he pointed out that there had been a change of circumstances since the adoption by Parliament of the policy which it was now asked should be extended. About ten years ago the voluntary schools were made available for certain purposes, but he did not suppose those purposes required much time or took away from the uses to which the managers desired to put the schools, except for an infinitesimal fraction of the year. But if this extension were accorded, was it not manifest that the use of the schools would be largely impinged upon by the demands made upon managers of provided schools in connection with circumstances and events which might constantly repeat themselves? He left it to lawyers to determine how long before an election meetings were connected with an election. It was evident, however, that the scope of the Amendment was very large as regarded time. These extended demands, moreover, would be thrown on managers when the demands upon them for education purposes were augmented. An Amendment had been passed making it obligatory on the managers to give three nights of the week to education, outside the ordinary school hours. He thought, therefore, that to require that, on the demand of the education authority, they should give up their schools to every kind of political purpose would be taking too large a slice of the time at their disposal for their own purposes or for parochial purposes unconnected either with education or politics. In addition, such an arrangement might lead to considerable hardship. Supposing a General Election turned on this Bill, it seemed a little hard that meetings should be held in these schools for the purpose of destroying them. Taking a general survey of these objections, he thought it better not to introduce the Amendment into the Bill.

SIR HENRY FOWLER said he quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that they could not make this power applicable to one class of schools only. But he submitted that the words used in the Act of 1893–94, which provided for the use of the school-rooms receiving a grant out of moneys voted by Parliament was intended to impose the liability upon all schools alike. The right hon. Gentleman had put forward objections, one of time and one of substance. As to the first, when the Corrupt Practices Act was passed the extraordinary words "before, during, or after" were introduced, and some hon. Members asked "Will that cover both time and eternity?" Practically he believed it was accepted that the Act referred to came into force as soon as the writ was issued for the election of a Member of Parliament, and he did not think that any gentleman who this year or next incurred expenses in holding public meetings on behalf of his candidature for the next General Election would be required to include those expenses in his election return. It could not be suggested, therefore, that that particular objection put forward by the right hon. Gentleman was a very strong one. Then there was the objection of substance, the suggestion that too much time would be taken out of the period left to managers when the school could be used for parochial and other purposes. Already three nights of the week were set apart for education, outside the ordinary school hours, and the right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that the present Amendment would take too great a slice out of the remaining period. But was he prepared to say that no political meetings in connection with Parliamentary elections should be held in the school at all? They had heard a good deal said about the exercise of common sense by managers, but in the past the common sense exhibited had been to allow the use of the schools for these meetings to one political party and to refuse it to the other. In passing he might remark that in the Amendment there was a misprint and that the word "Parliamentary" should be substituted for "political." Was it proper, was it just, or was it right that on Monday evening there should be a political meeting held in support of Mr. A., who was to have the advantage of the room for the shelter of his auditors, while on the following evening, if Mr. B. desired to address his supporters, he was to be compelled to do so in the open, however inclement the weather might be. With regard to the suggestion that the adoption of the Amendment might cause interference with the educational work of the school he would suggest that that could be met by the insertion of some stipulations, but at any rate it must be made clear that if the use of the room was allowed to one side the other side should have an equal right to it.

(2.58.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE regretted that the Prime Minister had taken a rather illiberal view of the Amendment. On the question of procedure, his objection could easily be met by providing that the rule applicable to voluntary schools should be equally applicable to board schools, for he quite agreed that if the managers of voluntary schools were to be compelled by the Bill to throw open their school rooms for political meetings, board school rooms should be equally granted for the purpose; the same indulgence must be extended all round. It was perfectly true that his hon. friend might bring in his Amendment in the form of a new Clause at the end of the Bill; but they did not know what was going to happen, and they were bound to take the discussion when and where they could. It must be remembered that the situation had changed since 1893, that the demands for the use of the voluntary schools were greater than then, though it should also be remembered that the public subsidies to these schools were at present greater. He knew that an Amendment had been adopted the previous evening which gave the county authority the use of the schools for three nights a week for evening schools. His hon. friend the Member for North Camberwell had, however, shown that that was no great boon, for in less than 2,000 out of the 14,000 voluntary schools in the country were evening schools carried on. In fact in 12,000 schools no meeting was held in any one night of the week except, perhaps, on Sunday. His other point was that the use of the school was only to be given in connection with a candidature. He agreed with the Prime Minister that the moment a man became a candidate, although no election was imminent, the Corrupt Practices Act came into operation. But the Prime Minister talked as if political meetings were held by both sides twice a week. Why, a circus came round to these rural districts much oftener, and the result was that the agricultural labourers ran to these political meetings. He asked hon. Gentlemen opposite how often they went down to address their constituents. A Member of Parliament who went down once a week [laughter]—he meant once a year—regarded himself as a martyr. The Prime Minister talked as if these political meetings were to be held once a week, and that hon. Members became quite exhausted at the end of the vacation and took their holidays in the House of Commons. These political meetings were very rarely held, and he put it that there was really an educational purpose in them after all. [Laughter.] He did not mean merely Liberal meetings—that went without saying. But the conflict of meetings of men on both sides elucidating political questions—(he would not object even to his friends of the Liberal League addressing the meetings so long as they discussed anything connected with the Government of the country)—would serve as a good sound political purpose. From that point of view, therefore, the Prime Minister ought to encourage such meetings. The right hon. Gentleman had said that it would be carrying the thing too far if they were to lend Church schools, built by Church money, for the purpose of advocating the destruction of those schools. But if it was Church money that had built the schools, it would now be Nonconformist furniture that was in the schools. In his own constituency four-fifths of the ratepayers were Nonconformists, and in the event of a row it would be their furniture that would suffer, and not the schools. The Prime Minister said it was going too far to say that a voluntary school should ring with the doctrines of Nonconformists, but it was much worse that the Nonconformist desk should be pounded by an Anglican orator in denunciation of Nonconformist heretics. Of course it was only fair that a rent should be paid for the use of the schools. The proposition of the Amendment was not so alarming, and he trusted that the Prime Minister would reconsider his decision and permit meetings to be held in the schools subject to regulations approved of by the Secretary to the Education Department, who would see that everything that was fair to the Church would be done.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he hoped his right hon. friend the Member for Wolverhampton would pardon him for saying that it was not fair to the managers of the voluntary schools to allege they refused the use of their schools to one political party and gave it to another. His connection with voluntary schools extended over a considerable part of Yorkshire and Lancashire, and he maintained that any manager, or group of managers, would be denounced by the whole community if they did so. He believed that the cases where the use of the schools had been refused were exceedingly rare, if they existed at all. His next point was that after the grant of the use of the schools for evening schools for three days in the week, scant time would be afforded to the managers for using the schools for the purpose to which they had been dedicated. Even in his own parish, without this restriction, there was difficulty in obtaining the use of the schools for any additional purpose; and if further restrictions were imposed the working of the trust-deeds under which these schools were conducted would be seriously hampered and prejudiced. In the Act of 1893-94 it was laid down that there was not to be any interference with the school hours of the voluntary schools, or of any evening school, but he found no reference to that in the Amendment of his right hon. friend.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that hon. Members on both sides were prepared to accept an Amendment to the Amendment in the sense of the Act of 1893-94.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said that in the Act of 1893-94 there were some provisions which would tend to mitigate the severity of the application of the rule in the proposed Amendment. Speaking for himself, on behalf of the voluntary schools he could not accept the Amendment as it stood.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) was rather astonished at the statement of the hon. Baronet that the voluntary schools were so much in use in the evenings. Even after granting them for the purposes of evening schools three days a week, that only amounted to 150 days in the year. A Parliamentary election came, on the average, only once in five years, and that meant two meetings. Municipal elections were held once in three years, and that meant one meeting, or at most two. He thought that under these circumstances the contention of the hon. Gentleman opposite must fall to the ground.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said that when a proposition of this sort had been brought before the House he had always supported it. He thought that the use of the school should not be given to one party and refused to the other. But regard must be had to the fact that so many nights in the week were now to be given for the evening schools; and the rights of the voluntary school managers in the remaining nights ought to be safe-guarded. He thought that the words "in connection with" were much too vague, and that the right to use the schools should be confined to cases where no other room was obtainable.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) submitted that there was a general agreement that something should be done in the direction proposed by the Amendment, if not at this point in another part of the Bill. He entirely agreed with the Prime Minister as to the undesirability of running the risk of using the school buildings for other than educational purposes, and he, for one, would insist that regulations to that effect should be framed. But that duty should be left to the local education authority, as it would be somewhat invidious to place it on the managers. In the interests of compromise he thought the right hon. Gentleman should consent to grant that advantage to political candidates. He thought no real harm would be done by that. Would it not be hard lines on the local authority if their views could not be advocated in the schools for which they paid? In the villages, at all events, these political meetings were really educational. They occurred rarely, and the people were really interested in them, as they afforded the only chance to the villagers of hearing political arguments. He thought they should not look upon the school buildings as still retaining their private character. Whatever that might be under the trust deeds, they must now come into existence for public purposes, and where the schools were the only premises available, it was only right and fair that they should be available for public purposes. He himself admitted that he had never had any difficulty in holding meetings in his constituency; but an incident did occur at one of his elections which made him think that he owed the free use of the voluntary schools in his constituency to his political opponent. On that occasion the use of a schoolroom was refused to him, but the school was afterwards made available for him through the representations of his political opponent; and the spirit which his opponent had then infused had governed the matter ever since. He made an appeal to the First Lord of the Treasury whether there was not an almost general agreement which would justify him in accepting the Amendment.

*MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said he desired to oppose the Amendment very strongly. It would very much interfere with the work of the schools at the very period of the year when time was most needed. Municipal elections were generally held in the autumn, and if the schools were to be used for election purposes, the whole winter session of classes organised by the managers might be interfered with. He opposed the Amendment also on a broader ground. He saw in it the thin end of the wedge. Hon. Members opposite were trying to make elections cheaper at other people's expense. They advocated that returning officers' fees should be paid by the public; and he regarded the Amendment as an attempt to enable candidates to hold their meetings at the expense of other people.

That was a very dangerous tendency. If gentlemen sought a seat in this House, they ought to be willing to bear the expense attaching to it.

MR. NUSSEY (Pontefract) said he regretted that the First Lord of the Treasury could not see his way to comply with what was a general request on both sides of the House. He thought that he would not overstate the case when he said there were 8,000 parishes in the country where hon. Members could hold meetings only on sufferance. They had to go, cap in hand, to ask the managers whether they would be good enough to allow them to express their political views in the schools, although the schools were paid for by the ratepayers' money. The first objection of the Prime Minister was that the proposal did not extend to board schools. He would have been very glad if the proposal were extended to board as well as to voluntary schools, so that these schools would have been open for legitimate discussion to responsible persons such as candidates at the County Council, municipal or Parliamentary elections. The second objection of the Prime Minister was that the meetings would take up too much time, but he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that in the country meetings did not take much time. He lived in a constituency which was represented by an hon. Member opposite who, with the exception of a meeting he addressed last summer, had not held a meeting in the constituency for four or five years. It was an anomaly that the schools should not be allowed to be used for local purposes, and that a certain number of hon. Members, most of them sitting on one side of the House, should be debarred from discussing matters involving great national interests. The schools themselves would have a most direct interest in the County Council elections, and what could be more fitting than that the County Council candidates who, when elected, would form the local education authority, should have free use of the schools. It was quite right that a code of regulations should be inserted to prevent the right being abused. The hon. Member for the Brightside Division of Sheffield said the schools would be used at the very time they would be most wanted for educational purposes. He did not think that would be so, as ordinary elections in the country took place in March. If the Amendment were accepted, it would make matters fair all round. If not, the use of the schools should be prohibited to both parties. That would remove part of the grievance of which they complained.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was quite prepared to admit that in the speech he made half an hour ago, he might have laid too much stress on the actual number of hours that would be employed in election meetings. He might have exaggerated that aspect of the case, though he was sure he did not exaggerate the fear which an Amendment of that kind would excite in the bosoms of the managers of voluntary schools, who had just had three evenings a week cut off the time in which they could use the schools. He did not rise to express his views in a modified form, but to appeal to the Committee as to whether it would be wise to introduce, in a Bill of this kind, a topic which, as the right hon. Gentleman himself observed, had formed a great part of a Bill introduced *ad hoc* in 1892. He had looked at the Bill and could assure the Committee that the Clause which dealt with the question was the principal Clause in the Bill, and extended over more than a page of the inconvenient size on which they printed their Bills. He did not think they could really include a topic like that in a Bill which, whether it was a good or a bad Bill, did not deal with the question at all, except merely parenthetically. Even if they embarked upon it, they could not take the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman as their point of departure. If for no other reason, he objected to the Amendment on the ground—and he thought the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton agreed with him—that it was confined to the voluntary schools; and in the place in which it appeared, it must necessarily be confined to the voluntary schools. Any treatment of the subject should be general; and all the safeguards to be introduced should be considered by this House in a manner in which they could not be considered on that occasion. He imagined it would be in order to introduce a new Clause, practically repeating the Clause in his right hon. friend's Bill of 1892; and if the House had ample time to consider it, they might knock it into some shape, which would not make it unjust to the voluntary schools. But in the present condition of the discussion of the Bill, it would be folly to make a promise that he would ask the Committee to find time for discussing a parenthesis, which was altogether outside the real topic dealt with in the Bill. He was not saying that a provision of the kind proposed, made universal, could not be so safeguarded as to make it a reasonable and proper addition to the Statute-book; but he ventured to suggest that it should be introduced as a separate Bill, and at a time when the House would have an opportunity of discussing it.

MR. BRYCE said he thought he was right in saying that the right hon. Gentleman had practically admitted that the queston was one which ought to be dealt with. The right hon. Gentleman's contention was that it should be dealt with in a separate Bill. Twenty-two years ago that might have been a reasonable argument; but, nowadays, when a private Member's Bill which was opposed had really no chance of passing, the right hon. Gentleman might just as well have given a blank refusal as to tell them to bring in a private Member's Bill on the subject. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman himself bring in a Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not exclude the possibility of the Government dealing with the subject; and he carefully abstained from giving or withholding any pledge. What he said was that it was quite clear that it could not wisely or possibly be introduced at that stage into the present Bill.

MR. BRYCE said he thought he was right in saying that the House passed a unanimous Resolution in favour of the proposal in the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the Government of which he was a member went out of office in 1892.

MR. BRYCE said that that side of the House was in office for less than three years, whereas the Government were in office for more than eight years; and if there was any desire on the part of the Government to redeem their promise, they had more than twice the opportunity the Opposition had had. The right hon. Gentleman must feel that he could not relegate to the dim, distant, and uncertain future a matter which could be so properly dealt with in the present Bill, and for this reason. The Bill made these schools the property of the ratepayers for educational purposes; it gave them a full right to use the schools for educational purposes. It changed the character of these schools by giving them assistance out of the rates, and made them public in a way in which they were not public previously. Surely, then, it was only right that the public should be allowed to meet in them and discuss public matters. It was not a grievance which affected municipalities so much as villages, because in the towns the Board school-rooms were invariably larger, but it was a very great grievance in the villages of this country, for the reason that the village school very often was the only place in which a meeting could be held. He could not help, even at this late stage, making one last appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to agree now to a modified form of this Amendment and settle the question.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said the importance of the question had been shown by the arguments used against it. Years after the passing of the original Act, the House of Commons had to pass a special Act to rectify an omission in that Act, and that was a reason surely for not perpetuating the omission in this Act. The grievance, though not perhaps so apparent, was very real. Most hon. Members had felt the difficulty at election times of getting the use of a school-room for election purposes on a particular evening. He had experienced the difficulty both of giving and obtaining the use of a schoolroom for political meetings. In most cases, it was true, the managers let the schools to both sides, but not often for the same sum, and it was, he submitted, not fair, for the managers ought not to be allowed to charge one side more than the other. The Committee would be willing to accept a modified Clause in the Act. Let the Government put four lines in the Act, and leave it to the Education Department to make any recommendation they liked. The Department surely could put in a condition that would prevent any injury being done to the schools.

(3.38.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question, 'That those words be there inserted,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 187; Noes, 85. (Division List, No. 442.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A (Worc.
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J (Manch'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J F (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J E. B (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan,Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Channing Francis Allston
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey,Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne,Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorgeSmyth
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Norton,Captain Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,Rt Hn. CR. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas,Abel(Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner,Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.

(3.51.) Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 91; Noes, 189. (Division List, No. 443.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen,Charles P.(Glouc.,Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne,Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill,Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse,Henry(Somerset,E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorgeSmyth
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer,Sir CharlesM.(Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer,RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel(Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,F.Freeman-(Hastings)
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H, (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J. A (Worc.
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The rest of the Amendments on pages 14, 15, and 16 are not in order.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) agreed that the first part of his Amendment on page 14 was out of order, but he submitted hat he might be in order in moving the insertion of the words—

> "At any meeting the presence of at least three shall be required to form a quorum."

*THE CHAIRMAN: The question as to the number of the managers has already been dealt with in Clause 7. The next Amendment which is in order is that of the hon. and learned Member for Dundee.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I do not move now, because I understood the question is to be dealt with in another part of the Bill.

(4.3.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the word "If," in line 25, stand part of the Clause' be now put:"—

Question put, "That the Question 'That the word "If," in line 25, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

The Committee divided; Ayes 211, Noes 86. (Division List No. 444.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert

Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)

Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.

Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stro'd
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James

Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorg'n, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.

(4.14.) Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 218; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 445.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds

Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow

Carlile, William Walter
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J. A (Worc.
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry

Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, SW.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary, (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S'Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lecky, Rt Hon. William Edw. H
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareh'm
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G. Ellison
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Maj. E. J. B (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n N.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas, (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.

Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durh'm)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E)
Thomas F. Freeman-(Hastings)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay, T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Trevelyan and Mr. Runciman.

(4.26.) MR. BRYCE moved to insert in Clause 8, line 25, after "If" the words "The managers of any school fail to comply with the above conditions no assistance from the rates or the Parliamentary grant shall be given to such school," and to omit all the words after "If" down to the end of line 29. His view was that in the matters dealt with in the sub-Sections of the Clause it was better that the local education authority should be the judge and that there should be no appeal at all to the Board of Education. That was also the view of his right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouthshire who gave notice of the Amendment. His right hon. friend thought, and he agreed with him, that there ought to be a distinct and unequivocal assertion that as soon as a school failed to fulfil the provisions of any sub-Section no claim should be made for rate aid. Now there was a certain amount of justification for his proposal. It was to be found in the fact that within the last few days, during the consideration of this Clause, they had been piling up difficulties and ambiguities, and possibly questions on which divergence of opinion must arise, all of which were to be referred to the Board of Education. Those appeals would do a great deal to make the working of the whole Bill, if it became an Act, extremely difficult and extremely vexatious to the local education authorities; and unsatisfactory to the local managers. He did not think that there had ever been brought forward a scheme more complicated and more fertile in occasions for friction. It was an unsuccessful attempt to reconcile principles which were fundamentally opposed. Take, for instance, the case of religious instruction, in regard to which it was very likely that appeals would be sent to Whitehall if this sub-Section were passed. The theory of the sub-Section was that the local managers were to be entirely responsible, and to have complete control over religious instruction, and that the local education authorities had no right to intervene in any way. But it had been at the same time urged, with great force, and, he confessed, with some appearance of truth, that if there was to be in the schools a religious atmosphere, it should pervade the whole school, that it should not be confined to religious instruction, but carried on and make itself felt in the secular education. Then they would have difficulty as to what were religious and what were secular hours. They had endeavoured to deal with one of those questions by proposing that the local education authorities should have power to enforce the Conscience Clause, and an extraordinary divergence of opinion had been elicited as to what the Clause meant, even in the mind of the Attorney General. It was admitted that there was a power of appeal, but how far could that appeal go or be reported to Whitehall? All that was left in the dark, and that was a darkness which was certain to produce friction. Take the case of the use of the buildings. The scheme of the Board was that the buildings of the voluntary schools were to remain the property of the managers, but at the same time the use of the buildings was to be in the hands of the local education authority during the hours of secular instruction. It could be easily seen that disputes would arise in regard to furniture, repairs, and the use of the school at other times, in regard to the claim made upon them by the local authority for the purposes of what was called secondary education. What struck him was the number of difficulties that would arise from the extreme complications of this scheme. How much simpler it would have been to transfer the property in the schools to the local education authority and make them masters. If that was objected to on pecuniary grounds, let the pecuniary difficulty be met and dealt with. He would take another point. It had been generally felt by educational reformers that one of the most important things for efficiency of local schools was that a good deal of power should be vested in the local managers, and if the Government had been free they would have listened to the voice of educational experts, and would have given to the local managers wide powers to carry on their schools in a manner which their local experience of local feeling told them would be best. Although it was true that the school managers in a borough were only the servants or agents of the School Board, yet they were constantly under the eye of the School Board; the School Board might delegate powers to them in a way not possible in the case of the managers of country schools. The Government had been unable to confer those wide powers on the rural managers because they were obliged to set up some sort of popular control. As they could not give it to the people on the spot, they gave a semblance of it to the local education authority sitting in the county seat. What was the result? The local managers were not to have the power they ought to have, and the local education authority was so far removed that it could not exercise control effectively over the managers in the rural districts. That being so, he thought that the next best thing they could do was to facilitate the working of the schools by vesting a wide and complete power in the local education authority, and to do that it would be necessary to get rid of the appeal to the Board of Education which was given by this sub-Section. He therefore proposed to leave out the words "appeal to the Board of Education." His Amendment was that the local education authority should be the final judge in these matters. He was quite sure that that was a plan which would be found to work easiest and simplest, and with most efficiency. They had had expressed from both sides of the House great confidence in the judgment and good sense of the local education authority. He was assured that they would have no motive in endeavouring to interfere with religious instruction, or the legitimate use of the school buildings by the local managers. He thought that this was one of those cases where they might, with great confidence, leave it to the local education authority, in the belief that they would not abuse their power, but use it in the public interest, and not to the disadvantage of the managers. Therefore it would be better not to check them in their work. It would be quite unworthy to subject these great local authorities to constant appeals to Whitehall. The First Lord had expressed a sanguine hope that the conferring of educational functions on these local authorities would induce a great number of able and public-spirited citizens to devote themselves to educational work; but what encouragement would be given them to undertake those functions if they were subjected at every point to an appeal to the Board of Education in Whitehall. He contended that not only on the ground of local interest, but of respect to the local education authority, these ought not to be subjected to such appeals. He feared that if this Section was passed in its present form it would be found impossible to work the scheme, and even if it did work, it could not last; and in the course of two or three years Parliament would have to tinker the Act by passing another Bill. They should endeavour to avoid that danger, and to avoid anything which would make the local education authorities resent the position of inferiority in which they would be placed by this Clause. They should trust them fully.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 25, to leave out the words from the word 'If,' to the end of line 29, and insert the words 'the managers of any school fail to comply with the above conditions no assistance from the rates or the Parliamentary grant shall be given to such school.'"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'any question,' stand part of the Clause."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said that the right hon. Gentleman had raised a question which, no doubt, was of very great importance, in a speech of perfect clearness, and in a manner to which no one, who was interested in education, could take the slightest exception. He desired very shortly to submit to the Committee his reasons for thinking that the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman was a mistake, and that they should reject it. His right hon. friend had spoken of the necessity of trusting the local education authority. He had said before, and he repeated it, that the Government had every confidence that the local education authorities would be reasonable, and that the spirit in which they would administer this Bill would be everything that could be desired. But that did not settle the matter. The question was, what was to be the machinery for solving questions that might arise in dispute between the managers and the local education authorities? He believed that both the managers and the local education authorities would do their best fairly and honestly to carry out the provisions of the Act; but it was possible that they might differ in some points, and in case of dispute who was to decide between them? The managers might take one view and the education authority another, and then who was to decide? As he understood it, the effect of the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman was that in a dispute between the managers and the local education authority the local authority should settle the controversy. With every confidence in the local authority and other representative bodies, he could not think it would be either wise or practicable to trust them with the decision of disputes in which, conceivably, feeling might run high and to which they had been parties. The right hon. Gentleman desired to leave all the decisions to the local education authority. To carry out that wish the introduction of other words into the Section would be necessary, because if the Amendment were carried in the form in which it was put down by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire, or in the amended form of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen, these disputes would have to go to courts of law for decision, because they had Sections which provided that in various events the rights of managers should be forfeited. If a dispute arose as to whether those events had happened, according to the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman, a court of law would have to determine the point. He thought the Committee would be of opinion that it would be extremely undesirable that such a question as, for instance, the limit of religious or secular teaching, or abstruse questions of that kind, should be ventilated in the High Courts. They were questions of some delicacy; questions absolutely unsuitable, in his opinion, for decision by the best of County Councils, and he ventured to think that even the High Court was not the best tribunal to deal with these matters. But the Bill provided an effective and an easy way of determining any questions that might arise, which would be an appeal to the Board of Education. Looking at the section as amended by the Committee, the Committee would see that the nature of the questions that might arise made it necessary to provide some means of deciding them at once. As the whole question of the appeal to the Board of Education was raised by the Amendment, he would show the Committee how the right of appeal would work in the case of each of the sub-Clauses. The Committee would see exactly what questions would arise in the various sub-Clauses (*a*) (*b*) (*c*) (*d*) and (*e*). He reminded the Committee that the early part of the Clause stated the conditions on the performance of which the right of maintenance by the school out of the rates depended, and also made the performance of those conditions necessary in order to earn the Parliamentary grant. Who were to determine whether or not those conditions had been broken? The first condition was that any direction of the education authority as to secular instruction in the schools, including the number of teachers to be employed, and with reference to the dismissal of teachers on educational grounds, was to be carried out. That gave the educational authority the power to issue its directions to managers with regard to any matter of secular instruction, including the matters which it had been thought proper to specify so fully under that head. Directions given by the local education authority on those matters could not be questioned as being improper or unreasonable directions, because the local education authority had been made the judge in that matter, and in that case there could be no appeal at all. Someone must be trusted with some directions, and the Government trusted the local authority. But the difficulty might arise under this Section as to whether a matter referred to was a matter of secular instruction or whether it trenched on religious instruction. Did the Committee think that they should adopt an Amendment which would leave a matter of that kind to be settled by the courts of law? A speedy decision was necessary in order that the schools might go on without friction, and from the nature of the case itself, it was not one suitable for a court of law to decide On the other hand, did they think they could possibly adopt the proposal advocated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen which left the matter to be decided by the authorities who had first given the directions to the managers? He submitted that both alternatives were impossible, and the only remedy was to leave the Board of Education to deal with matters of this kind. These matters were in their very nature matters which had to be decided at once, and, by a process of exhaustion the Government were driven to a tribunal which was eminently competent and absolutely impartial. The only question under sub-Clause (*a*) was whether the directions had been carried out. He need hardly say anything as to Clause (*b*) because the only question that could arise upon it was whether the managers had been instructed by the local authority.

MR. BRYCE pointed out that "inspection" came into that sub-Clause, and that great difficulty might arise.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said the Board of Education dealt with such questions as that every day. Sub-Clause (*c*) was an important sub-Clause dealing with the appointment and dismissal of teachers, and the questions which might arise there were two: the first relating to the appointment, the second relating to the dismissal, of teachers. The consent of the local education authority was required for the appointment of the teachers, and they were not to be dismissed except on educational grounds. It might be said the consent was withheld not on educational grounds; that the circumstances were such as to show that the local education authority had refused their consent not on those grounds but on some others relating to the religious tenets or the political views of the candidate. He did not expect such a case to arise; the spectres which had been conjured up with regard to this Act were spectres conjured up under the stimulus of political oratory. He believed the Bill would work very smoothly; but if such a question did arise there must be some remedy. The Committee had passed the Clause that the local education authority should not refuse its consent except on educational grounds. Who was to decide whether it had or not? The right hon. Gentleman said the local education authority itself! But they could not go into it because their probity had been impeached. With regard to the dismissal of the teachers, the managers might allege that they were entitled to dismiss a teacher because he was giving religious education on lines against the religious doctrines of the school. The education authority might say their consent ought to be obtained; that the teacher was dismissed, not on religious grounds, but because of some personal jealousy. Who was to decide that? Somebody must, and it was suggested by the right hon. Gentleman that it should be decided by the body that made the charge. As to sub-Clause (*c*) a question might arise as to whether the school building was really required for educational purposes for the evenings of three days a week, and whether the local authority had not sufficient accommodation in their own schools. The managers might allege that the local authority were sparing the use of their own schools and making use of the non-provided schools. That would have to be settled by the Board of Education. The difficulty of the rent of the teacher's house could be solved by the ratebook of the neighbourhood, but if a dispute arose some one must settle it. Repairs might give rise to questions. An obligation was imposed on the managers to keep the premises in repair. Suppose the local education authority said they were not in repair and the managers said they were? It was not a great question, but if issue was joined upon it it would have to be determined at once. That was a question which was constantly before the Board of Education, and he submitted there could be no better tribunal. "Alterations and improvements" might raise very important questions, because by the decision of the Committee the local education authority were only entitled to make "reasonable" requests for alterations and improvements. This was a point on which particularly disputes were most likely to arise. The local education committee might say they wanted certain improvements made in the building, and the managers might retort, "We think your request is unreasonable, and you are only entitled to request reasonable improvements." The right hon. Gentleman wished by his Amendment that the decision in such a matter as that should remain with the local education authority. The right hon. Gentleman would agree that they could hardly expect the managers, who had to find the money for improvements which they thought unreasonable, to be in entire agreement with him. He need not detain the Committee with regard to sub-Clause (*e*). The only question that could arise on that was as to the amount of damage done to the building and furniture, and whether the school-room had been put into a proper condition for scholastic work after it had been used for other purposes. He submitted that he had shown that there might in a small number of cases be a small number of questions that might arise between the managers and the local education authority. The suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman was that the decision of those questions should be left with the local education authority, whilst that of the Government was that it should be left with the Education Department, and he left it with confidence to the Committee to say which of those solutions was the better.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) said the fallacy that underlay the whole of the Attorney General's argument appeared to him to be that he insisted upon putting the local education authority upon an equality with the managers, and for the right hon. Gentleman to further say that the County Council would be a party to a dispute was begging the question. If a County Council could be trusted to carry out its duties there should be no difficulty whatever in allowing them to do so. They had been told that the basis of this Bill was that the Education Department was unfit or was not so fit as the local education authority, to know what the requirements in the various districts were, and he submitted with confidence, even to the Attorney General himself, that the education authority was a much fitter body to deal with these matters than the Education Department. But the hon. and learned Gentleman had told them that in matters of this kind one of the best courts in the country would be a tribunal with the hon. Gentleman the Secretary of the Board of Education at its head. For his part he should much prefer to leave this matter to the commonsense of the community. How was it possible for the hon. Gentleman representing the Education Department in this House to find out what was reasonable and what was not as between a County Council and voluntary school managers? The only possible way would be for the hon. Gentleman to send his inspector down to enquire into the matter, and then they would have the melancholy spectacle of a County Council being placed upon its trial before an inspector of the Education Department. That would be a most degrading position to place the authority in. Surely the local education authority constituted under this Bill must be as capable, or more so, of deciding this point than any inspector sent down. He could not conceive anything more humiliating than for the County Council to be summoned to give evidence before an inspector who had no knowledge of the subject which he had to investigate. He maintained that the Clause as it stood must be a constant source of irritation between the local authorities and the managers, and so far as appeals went, the managers could appeal to the Board of Education for the cost of the postage stamp which franked their letter. But if they had to appeal to a court of law, that would cost money, and they would, he thought, be chary of risking a lawsuit with the County Council. Giving to the Board of Education the power of deciding all these questions would not decentralise, but practically centralise, education, because the whole authority would rest with the Board of Education. One argument on which the Bill had been defended was that it would decentralise education, but under this Clause it would be directed from Whitehall as hitherto. The whole Clause was a perfect farce. It would create great friction and irritation. It showed a want of trust in the new authority, and as a member of a County Council he repudiated it most strongly and should support the Amendment.

*(5.18.) MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) thought there would be less opposition to this sub-Section if Members had a wider knowledge of what transpired under the existing law. It was a very common occurrence for the largest School Boards to apply to the Board of Education for its ruling on questions affecting the conduct of their own schools. The point had been argued as though the disputes would necessarily be of an acrimonious character. He did not anticipate that at all. What he expected was, that a County Council would take a certain view of the law and the local managers a slightly different one. The County Council might propose to establish in some voluntary school such a regulation which the managers claimed to be altogether inapplicable. Who was to decide such a point? Were they to waste the ratepayers' money in litigation, or to go to people who had spent their lives in determining these small points of detail, who knew exactly the effect of the last legal decision or the last decision of the Board of Education, and who could put the local authority straight without unnecessary delay or friction? He could hardly conceive antagonistic dealings arising when both parties knew that they would be appealing to an impartial tribunal which, without cost and with little delay, would settle the point at issue. There was one question, however, that he would like cleared up. He was not quite certain of the force of the provision that compliance with this section should be one of the conditions on which the Parliamentary grant would be paid. Would that empower the Board of Education to withhold the Parliamentary grants from the County Council? At present, in order to bring a School Board into subjection and compel it to carry out the law, the Board of Education was able to withhold from that School Board the Parliamentary grants with respect to the particular school in regard to which the difficulty had occurred. The withdrawal of the Parliamentary grants would tend to induce the County Council to carry out the decisions of the Board of Education, but it would have no influence on the school concerned, inasmuch as the latter would not in any case receive the grant. The local authority was charged with the maintenance of the school, no matter what Parliamentary grant it might receive; therefore, while no penalty was imposed on the school, a penalty might perchance be imposed on the County Council. In the event of the voluntary school managers declining to obey the decision of the Board of Education, they could be effectually reduced to subjection by the withdrawal of the entire support of that school by the County Council, and in an extreme case, the erection of another school. The point he desired to be informed upon was whether this last provision was intended to be a penalty applicable to the County or Borough Council; if so, not only was the sub-Section sound, but it was absolutely essential to the smooth working of the Bill.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) reminded the Attorney General that the County Councils were advised by capable lawyers in the persons of their chief and assistant clerks, who were, so far as the interpretation of an Act of Parliament was concerned, as efficient a body as a court of law. If the object of the Section was to prevent delay, there could be no better way of securing it than by giving the local authority power to stop supplies unless the management carried on the necessary instruction. The local authority in the case of a county was the High Court of the county for all civil purposes, and, therefore, it ought to, and could, be safely entrusted with powers such as the Amendment sought to confer. There was no fear of the County Councils making unreasonable demands on the managers; the tendency, in his view, was more likely to be in the direction of slackness than undue stringency. Speaking as a County Councillor, he thought these bodies, if they were to be endowed with the enormous powers proposed by the Bill, were worthy of having placed in their hands the power of withholding supplies, if, through stubbornness or stupidity, the managers failed to provide proper accommodation and appliances for the education of the children. The management was only a parochial committee, and to give that committee power to defy and wrangle with the great county authority was unwise, and would not tend to produce harmony in the administration of county affairs. Under those circumstances, he thought it was only reasonable to give the authority asked for. He was sure that for years to come the Education Department would find itself so bombarded from every part of the country, rural and urban, on questions of education, that they might very well throw overboard a comparatively small matter of this kind, which was, nevertheless, essential for the immediate and continuous progress of elementary education.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he had listened with some surprise and considerable alarm to the speech of the Attorney General. While discussing the previous sub-Sections the Prime Minister, on more than one occasion, told the Committee that his desire was that the local education authority should be supreme.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Supreme in its own sphere.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said the right hon. Gentleman had done his best to limit matters in which an appeal should be allowed. They understood that the only appeal would be between secular and religious sections. The right hon. Gentleman said there would be an appeal about sub-Section (*d*) for alterations and improvements, and it was said that those were large matters upon which there was to be an appeal. He did not think the First Lord of the Treasury would deny that those were the only two points upon which there was a right of appeal from the local authority. The Attorney General, by his speech, had put a totally different complexion upon it. When he got to the sub-Section dealing with damage caused to furniture, he went so far as to say that where there was any question of dispute there an appeal would lie. If that was the way the local authority was to be treated, it seemed to him that the speech of the Attorney General put the managers absolutely on an equality with the local authority in regard to every question. There was, according to the Attorney General, an absolute right of appeal from the local authority, and it was not a question of one authority being superior to the other. Was this going to be the construction put upon the Clause which they understood was going to be very much improved? The First Lord of the Treasury admitted that the drafting was too broad. If the construction of the Attorney General were right, that the managers were to have an appeal in every single minute detail where there was friction, the education authority would be put in a difficult position and there would be an enormous amount of delay. Surely the obvious solution was to allow the right of appeal only in matters of very material and vital importance. The Attorney General said they were raising spectres of difficulties and disputes. He had had some experience in the management of elementary schools and he should like to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman if he had had any experience of these everyday matters which arose in schools. Had he ever been a manager or been in an elementary school in England? With all due respect, he ventured to think that the Attorney General was not capable of appreciating these matters. If his interpretation was to stand, he hoped the Prime Minister would recollect the impression left upon the Committee on this point a few days ago, and do something to allay their alarms upon it.

(5.40.) MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) thought it was rather hard for the hon. Member for Poplar to say that the Attorney General was not qualified to give a legal view if he had never been to an elementary school. The matter they were now dealing with was really a very serious one. It might be regarded from three points of view. Many hon. Members thought there ought not to be any right of appeal at all, but assuming that there was to be a right of appeal to whom or to what body ought that right to be given? Again, if they had decided that the right of appeal must exist, and also decided upon the tribunal, the question remained in what cases might they have recourse to that right. They had already discussed this point, and he took it that the House of Commons had decided that in certain cases there should be an appeal. Therefore anything outside those cases was a legitimate subject for discussion upon this Amendment. With regard to the question as to what court, or what body, or tribunal they were to appeal, he agreed with the Government that it would be much better to have an appeal to some body like the Education Department rather than to a court of law. It was better to have an appeal upon administrative matters to an administrative body. He agreed that it would be hopeless to have appeals to Courts of Law upon any of the questions arising under this Section. There was another matter, and a most important one, and it was in what matters were they to have a right of appeal? The Committee ought to lay down that there ought not to be a right of appeal at all, except on most important subjects, and it was for the Government to decide what matters there ought to be an appeal upon. It was not for the Opposition to point out that they ought not to have an appeal in this or that matter, but it was for the Government to make up their minds what were the large matters and important subjects upon which the appeal was to take place. He agreed with his hon. friend the Member for Poplar that the appeals ought to be limited to two subject matters: (1) whether or not in any direction given by the local authority they were trenching upon the jurisdiction of the managers, because they were affecting to deal with religious and not secular instruction; and (2) that they were to have a right of appeal against any decision of the local authority referring not to repairs, but to the improvement or alteration of the building. Assuming that there ought to be a right of appeal, in order to define whether a certain direction or order on the line of religious or secular instruction, and that there ought to be a right of appeal on alterations and improvements, they ought now to consider whether they were confining the right of appeal to these subjects. He could conceive of no broader words, giving a right of appeal, than the words of this sub-Section, and he thought a court of law would say in every particular that there would be a right of appeal. Take *seriatim* some of the things. The first part of the Section said—

> "In the case of a school not provided by them, the following conditions and provisions are complied with."

Obviously, a question which would come up would be the question whether any of "the following conditions" were complied with. That would open the door to an appeal in every case, and give a right of appeal to the managers. In sub-head (*a*) it was provided—

> "(*a*) The managers of the school shall carry out any directions of the local education authority as to the secular instruction to be given in the school."

Whether or not that was complied with was a question which might very well arise. He asked whether or not, in the event of a direction not being complied with by the managers, there would be an appeal.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said it was very likely there would be an appeal.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that was a matter of very great importance. The appeal might be on the question whether or not a direction was to be carried out on the smallest matter in connection with the management of the school. He supposed that similar questions must arise with regard to the direction given as to the "number and educational qualifications of the teachers to be employed." He thought there ought to be an appeal within the meaning of sub-Section 2 in that case. Sub-Section (*b*) stated that—

> "(*b*.) The local education authority shall have power to inspect the school."

It did not appear likely that there would be an appeal under that. Sub-Section (*c*) said—

> "(*c*.) The consent of the local education authority shall be required to the appointment of teachers, but that consent shall not be withheld except on educational grounds, and the consent of the authority shall also be required to the dismissal of a teacher unless the dismissal be on grounds connected with the giving of religious instruction in the school. Provided that assistant teachers and pupil teachers may be appointed, if it is thought fit, without reference to religious creed or denomination."

There might be a state of things where, under that sub-Section, an appeal might be taken. He wished to know whether there would be an appeal on questions of repairs dealt with in sub-Section (*d*).

SIR ROBERT FINLAY replied that if the local education authority said the buildings were in need of repair and the managers said they were not, there must be some authority to decide the matter.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that was surely a matter which the local education authority ought to decide. It was idle to say that there ought to be an appeal in such a case. They were asked to say that the inspector or surveyor employed by the local authority was not competent to state whether a school was in sufficient repair or not. The terms of sub-Clause 2 were much too wide. It was not for him to indicate now what form of words should be put in the sub-Section, but he submitted that, with the view to the peaceful and successful working of Clause 8 in the educational machinery of the country, they ought to limit the right of appeal on questions which might give rise to dispute between the local authority and the school managers. It should also be made clear whether the local authority had the right to call upon the managers to make improvements or alterations which might mean structural alterations or additions to the school. Of one thing he felt confident, and that was, that on all these minor matters there ought not to be an appeal. The sub-Clause was now in a condition in which it ought not to emerge from the Committee.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said it must be apparent to the Government that the terms of the sub-Clause were far too wide. He did not say they were too wide as the Clause was drawn in its original form, but since that time all sorts of qualifications and additions had been made, and in consequence of the new wording there were now points on which appeals might arise, though appeals would not have been possible on them before. Therefore it seemed to him that, if the sub-Clause stood in its original form, the Board of Education would be overwhelmed with work during the next few years, and a very large staff would be required. He would point out to the Government that the multiplication of appeals on individual points would tend to bring about a deadlock in the management of the schools. Sub-Clause (2) contained a condition which he supposed was intended by the draftsman of the Bill to give the Board of Education power over the managers as well as over the local authority. It was that—

"... compliance with this Section shall be one of the conditions required to be fulfilled by an elementary school in order to obtain a Parliamentary grant."

In the case of the managers being contumacious the Parliamentary grant was to be withdrawn from that particular school, but the Parliamentary grant was by Clause 13 to form a portion of the money of the local authority for educational purposes. The local authority could hardly be expected under the circumstances to maintain the school. Was that so?

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said that if a school ceased to earn the Parliamentary grant the local authority would be no longer liable to maintain the school.

*MR. YOXALL said he wished to put this position. Suppose on an appeal the Board of Education decided in favour of the managers and the local authority refused to accept the decision, could the Board compel compliance? Unless they did so the school would come to an end and the whole process of the appeal would be rendered nugatory. No good would have been done to the school, but infinite harm. He was afraid that would happen again and again if the sub-Clause now before the Committee was sustained. They would hardly expect to get the great local authorities of Lancashire, the West Riding of Yorkshire or Birmingham to submit on infinitesimal points emerging under this Clause to the Board of Education in disputes as between a body of six managers and themselves. A dispute in the first instance would arise with the local education committee and the managers. The decision of that committee could be reviewed and if necessary reversed by the local education authority. This fact lessened the need for an appeal to the Board of Education. He urged upon the Government that, having regard to the statement in the text of Clause 8, to the new points which had been added, and in respect to the admirable additions—for they were admirable—which had been made to it, that it became necessary to revise the terms of sub-Section 2 in the direction of making them narrower. The sub-Section went too far, and would inevitably lead to acute disputes arising from political and doctrinal reasons, and from wounded pride and dignity. Another difficulty in the way of the smooth working of the Bill would be largely removed if the Government would consent to reconsider the terms of sub-Section 2, and insert some such words as would give an appeal from the managers to the Education Committee, and from the Education Committee to the County Council or the Borough Council. If the managers could not obtain what they called "justice" after that, it might be fairly contended that justice was not on their side, and that no appeal should lie to the Board of Education.

(6.2.) MR. BECKETT (Yorkshire, N.R., Whitby) said that an appeal to the Board of Education was, in his opinion, right, desirable and necessary; but he had listened to the Attorney General's speech, and had been struck with the multiplicity of the points on which an appeal to the Board of Education might lie. He asked the Government whether it would not be possible to limit, or at least to specify, the points on which an appeal could be made to the Board of Education.

SIR EDWARD GREY said that the Attorney General had insisted that they had raised spectres of the friction which might arise, but the right hon. and learned Gentleman had in his speech proceeded to clothe those spectres with flesh and blood. He began by giving the Committee the points of appeal which might arise in reference to sub-Section (*a*), but as the Bill now stood it was evident that there might be a few on any part of the Clause as to what was religious education, what was control, and what was legitiemat expenditure? Suppose the local education authority said to the managers of a school—"We require you to build another class room," and that the managers considered that an excessive demand, the latter would, as he understood it, have an appeal to the Education Department. If the Department decided that an extra class room was not required, and the local authority said, "Then we will do with one teacher less," he supposed that the managers would have another appeal.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that that was not so. The directions of the local authority as to secular instruction, including the number of teachers, were conclusive.

SIR EDWARD GREY said that in that case the local education authority against whom the appeal went would be able to punish the managers, or to bring pressure to bear upon them through its control over the expenditure. The Clause as it stood provided for the possibility of friction, and allowed the local education authority to find their own way.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that the local education authority would, in that way, punish the children and not the managers.

SIR EDWARD GREY said he would have thought that there was an appeal under the Bill as it stood. This brought him to the same point as had been raised by the hon. Member for Whitby, that it was desirable to restrict the possibility of these appeals as much as possible. He shared the terror of the Attorney General in regard to litigation in the Law Courts. He hoped the Committee would not put anything into the Bill which would bring the parties into the Law Courts. The First Lord had said that the local education authority should not be the judge in its own case. What did that mean? It meant that they were establishing a dual control, and they all knew that dual control had brought them into the greatest difficulty in Egypt, and in regard to the Irish land question. The Attorney General's speech showed an optimism which he could not share, because the right hon. and learned Gentleman had said how admirably the dual control would work between the Education Department and the local education authority. He however should say that they should limit the dual control on as many of these points as possible by making the managers subordinate to the local education authority. If there was to be an appeal, he would rather it was to be made to the Education Department than to the Law Courts, and therefore he should like to see words introduced into the section which would limit the points under which appeals could be made.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said he desired to call the attention of the Attorney General to the fact that in many cases another education authority had been introduced. In urban districts the authority which used the schoolroom out of school hours would not be the elementary authority, but the secondary education authority. It was possible that under this Clause a dispute might arise between the managers of the school and the County Council, and between the Borough Council and the County Council. In that case who was to decide? Let the Committee take the case in which a County Council used the schoolroom out of school hours for an evening school, and refused to make good the damage which might be done to the furniture and the room. As regarded the furniture, the dispute would be between the County Council and the Borough Council, and as regarded the damage to the room the dispute would be between the County Council and the managers. If that was not covered by the words of the sub-Section, would the Attorney General have them altered?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that before the Attorney General answered the question of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, he wished to ask another, which seemed to him necessary after the speech of his right hon. friend. His question was whether the Government proposed to keep this sub-Section unchanged as it stood? If so, it applied to board schools as well as denominational schools.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that there was an Amendment on the point later down on the Paper.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that if that provision did not apply to board schools, which would be disastrous, then he would be satisfied. There could be no doubt whatever that the language applied to the other sub-Sections, and if the Government did not intend the language to apply to the first sub-Section, surely it should be altered.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that in regard to the point raised by his right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University, probably the proper course would be to make the provision a separate sub-Section. For the reasons given by his right hon. friend below the gangway he thought that if the disputes referred to arose, and it was conceivable that they might, they should be left to the County Court. There could be no disputes between the managers in the case of provided schools, because they were purely agents of the local education authority, and might be discharged at their pleasure. The Government, however, had not the least objection to accept words which should make the point clear.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) pointed out that under the Bill the pupil teachers would in many places be instructed and examined by the pupil-teacher instructor, who would be an officer of the Technical Education Committee of the District Council, a body outside and independent of the managers. Difficulties would arise between the two authorities; for example, the managers might not like the instructor to visit their schools and inspect the work of the pupil teachers, yet inspection was necessary for efficient training. In such cases he asked would there be an appeal to the Education Department or to the County Council as the highest local education authority. These difficulties might arise, and he thought a word or two of explanation from the Attorney General would be most desirable.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said it must depend upon the precise nature of the dispute, and if what he had already said were applied to each particular case it would furnish the answer.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) rose to support the claim of every Member of the Opposition that the authority of the County Council should not by this Bill be diminished in power. The School Boards had gone, and all their works had departed, and the County Council was the authority set up by the Government in their place as the authority which must be entrusted with the work of education. It had therefore been a great pity to find that where this work was put upon them their power to a great extent had been taken away. They were entitled to some respect for the work they had done. Large sums of money had been entrusted to them to administer, and no appeal had been made, with regard to their actions, to a higher Court. He could see no necessity, therefore, to limit their dealings with the managers of the schools by a number of vexatious appeals, which could only give rise in the minds of the County Councils to a feeling that their authority was diminished. The confidence of the Government in the work of the County Councils had been shown by the fact that the South Kensington Department had now been ordered to hand over to them the whisky money, with the administration of which the Education Department had hitherto been entrusted. The County Councils had now been exercising their powers for thirteen years; they had proved to be efficient bodies, and, that being so, he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would not now diminish their authority.

Mr. BUTCHER (York) thought the House was generally agreed that some of these disputes must be decided by the Board of Education, but he wanted to know how the rest of the disputes were to be dealt with. He understood the suggestion was that those disputes which did not go to the Board of Education should be decided by one of the parties themselves, viz., the education authority. How did the matter stand? By this Clause certain obligations were imposed on the managers. If they discharged those obligations, they would have the right to call on the County Council for assistance; if they did not discharge them they could not call on that body. Disputes might arise between the managers on the one hand and the local education authority on the other. Was it conceivable that, in a dispute between those two parties, they should set up as the final court of appeal as to the merits of that dispute one of the parties themselves? The proposal was absurd on the face of it. The House, moreover, had already decided against that principle, the question having been introduced by way of Amendment on the 21st of the present month by one of the hon. Members for Birmingham.† On those two grounds he asked the House to reject the Amendment.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Might I appeal to the House to come to a decision now upon this point. I admit it is an important point, but it has been now a long time before the Committee, and it has been fully discussed. The speeches have not been by any means of a perfunctory character, and I suggest that the Committee should now be allowed to divide.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he viewed with the greatest apprehension this system of wholesale appeal which the sub-Section set up. The right of intervention on the part of the central authority to bring a local authority up to a higher standard, which had had a very beneficial effect, was one of the things which the Government proposed to strike out. The Government proposed to repeal all the sections of the Act of 1870 which gave the executive authority a right of intervention. This right of intervention which was now proposed was of quite a different character, and he looked upon it as tending to damp down progress, to veto the desire for educational progress in the localities. He agreed that a dispute as to what was secular and what religious was a subject which ought to be referred to a third party. What were the facts with regard to the financial condition of the voluntary schools? Many of them were in a hopeless condition, and there would be great difficulty in finding money to make repairs. Many of them had no voluntary subscriptions at all, and how were they to comply with the demands made on them as to lighting, heating, and sanitary and other arrangements? What would the Board of Education do? Eight hundred and eleven had no voluntary subscriptions at all; 715 had subscriptions which amounted to less than 1s. per child; in 1,370 the subscriptions were between 1s. and 2s. 6d. a child. All these schools being unable to meet

---

† See page 385.

the requirements of the local education authority, the Board of Education would have to step in to examine whether the demands were reasonable. Who was at present at the head of the Education Department? Lord Londonderry, who recently went out of his way to meet the chief inspectors of schools, and to tell them with regard to the schools, some of which were not well suited for the work, that they must not put the rules too rigidly into force. He felt that this veto would be disastrous.

(6.33.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words "any question," stand part of the Clause' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 239; Noes, 100. (Division List No. 446.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen,AugustusH'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r.
Balfour, Rt. HnGerald W(Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. AllenBenjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (D'rbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt, Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, RtHnJ. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Capt. Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, SirJohnCharlesReady
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland SirFredDixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, SirWilliam Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. SirWilliam Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. AilwynEdward
Fergusson, RtHn. SirJ. (M'nc'r.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, SirRobertBannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, SirRobertPenrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S(Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gore, Hn. GRC. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, SirEW(B'ryS Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, F'versham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. JamesHenry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, SirJoseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lecky, Rt. Hn. WilliamEdw. H.
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants, Fareham
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. CharlesW. (Evesham
Long, RtHn. Walter(Bristol S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, ReginaldJ. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, RtHn SirH. E(Wigt'n
MiddlemoreJohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)

More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (O'f'd Univ)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Ta'nt'n)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Symth
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hn. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J. A. (Glam'n., Gower)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

(6.48.) Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 243; Noes, 102. (Division List No. 447.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord

Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Charles Wm.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J A (Worc'r
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Ed'mnds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H. C (North'mb Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sh'ffi'ld
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald

Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES,
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thos. (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-

Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Phillipps, John Wynford

Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

(6.59.) **MR. A. J. BALFOUR** claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the word "arises," in line 25, to the word "grant," in line 29, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question That the words of the Clause from the word "arises," in line 25, to the word "grant," in line 29, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 232; Noes, 100. (Division List No. 448.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)

Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thomas H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount

Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred'rick
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'ds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F (Liverpool)
Lecky, Rt Hon. William Edw. H
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E. (Wig'n
Middlemore, Jno. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (I. of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Smith, H. C. (N'rth'mb. Tyn'side
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES — Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

(7.13.) Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 232; Noes, 98. (Division List No. 449.)

AYES

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckitt, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Charles William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Higginbottom, S. W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil

Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. William Edw. H.
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H E (Wigt'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffi'ld
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir Chas. Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickitt, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W (York, W R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee:—

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

(9.0.) SIR EDWARD GREY said the object of the Amendment he rose to move was to provide, in the event of conflict between the education authority and the managers, such a remedy as would not interfere with the education of the school, but would enable it to be carried on continuously and efficiently. He had no wish to enter into the controversies which had already occupied the attention of the Committee as to the probabilities of conflict, but his point was that the remedies already available under the Bill were not satisfactory. The power of the local authority to step in and carry out their own directions where they were neglected was not practicable without a power to appoint other managers. That power it was not proposed to give them. Neither would it be practicable to bring managers to reason by exercising their control over expenditure on salaries of teachers, as that remedy would defeat its own objects. It would be an unfair and cruel remedy. A third remedy — to treat the school as one which they were no longer bound to maintain—was also unsatisfactory, involving as it did a check to education during the conflict and the provision of a new school. The proposal of his Amendment was preferable because it would, in the event of a conflict, enable education to go on without any check to its efficiency. It was really the natural remedy. The local education authority and the managers were under the Bill to be partners; if they pulled together no doubt education would prosper; if they did not it would suffer administratively. When two persons did not pull together the business suffered and the remedy was for one partner to buy the other out—the one bought out being naturally the smaller partner. In this case the education authority was the largest partner. The question of compensation would need considerable adjustment. Of course it would not be fair to confiscate the building without any compensation. Where the school was absolutely owned by an individual the building would have to be taken over and full compensation paid to the owner. Where there was no absolute owner and the school building was under some trust there would have to be an adjustment of the compensation in harmony with the terms of the trust. The trust would in many cases not provide solely for religious education, but for general education, with a limiting provision that it should be in accordance with the principles of a particular denomination. In that case, he suggested that the principle followed would be that which he understood the Prime Minister to have adopted in regard to endowments, which were to be apportioned between the education authority as the authority responsible for secular education and the managers as responsible for religious instruction. It would be found that in a good many cases the schools had not been built entirely with trust money, but with the aid of voluntary subscriptions paid for the purpose of avoiding a school rate. Where subscriptions had been given to avoid a rate there need be no compensation, because the avoidance of a rate would be secured by handing over the school to the education authority. On the question of the fairness of applying the principle of compulsory purchase, or acquisition of the schools for rent, he had no doubt whatever. He had included rent because rents lent themselves readily to adjustment in cases where the use of the building was to be left to the trust for use on Sundays. Private rights were increasingly held subject to the rights of the public, and were often subordinated to the public right on fair compensation. Schools, in the nature of the case, could not be used for private purposes and were, in fact, constructed for public purposes. If ever there was a case where purchase was beyond question fair, it was a case of this kind. No scruple was made about giving to municipal authorities powers of compulsory purchase for the purpose of supplying a public need, and now one authority was being set up for the purposes of education Parliament ought to be at least as free in giving that authority such powers. It might be urged that the danger of conflict was so remote that it was inadvisable to put such a provision in the Bill, but the Bill itself alluded to the possibility of questions arising, and in debate the "parties in dispute" had been spoken of. That was a very ominous expression. If there was a chance of the education authority and the managers becoming parties to a dispute the will of the education authority must be made to prevail, and in such a way that the education of the district was not interfered with. He thought his Amendment afforded the best means of providing a remedy in the event of conflict.

Amedment proposed—

"In page 3, line 29, after the word 'grant' to insert the words 'and, in event of failure on the part of the managers to comply with any of the conditions of this section, the local education authority shall have power, subject to fair compensation to the owners, to acquire or rent the building and treat it as a school provided by them.'"—(*Sir Edward Grey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the right hon. Baronet had enumerated what he regarded as three possible ways of dealing with a body of managers who were either unable or unwilling to carry out the legitimate demands of the education authority. One of them he submitted was entirely illegitimate, and he agreed that the idea of punishing denominational or voluntary managers by mulcting the schoolmaster or starving the education of the children was out of the question. It was not desirable either in theory or in practice. But he did not take the same gloomy view of the remedies the Bill provided. It provided, in the first place, that where the managers did not carry out the orders of the education authority, that body might step in and carry out those orders themselves. The right hon. Baronet said that was quite impossible unless they had a new set of managers. That matter had been argued out at length, and he did not think it was desirable to reopen it; but in his judgment it provided a perfectly effective remedy. The education authority, without appointing new managers, would step in and give their orders to the schoolmaster and see that they were obeyed. The other remedy provided by the Bill was that if the managers declined to carry out the orders of the education authority, the school should cease to be a public elementary school or eligible to receive money out of the rates, and another school should be provided for the district, which should not be a voluntary school, but a provided school. At the first blush he would have thought that remedy would have been highly agreeable to hon. Gentlemen opposite. They had told the House over and over again that, even if they were forced to accept voluntary schools as a necessity, they looked to their extinction as an ideal, and he was greatly surprised that they should regard this remedy as not only impracticable and disagreeable, but also difficult to carry into effect. The right hon. Baronet had spoken of it as an impracticable remedy.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I did not use the word impracticable. I said mine was preferable.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would not pursue that line of argument, but would deal with what the right hon. Baronet regarded as the preferable method of turning a voluntary school into a provided school. He quite agreed that the right hon. Baronet's method would have at least one advantage if it prevented any gap in the educational accommodation of the district during the period of transition. But the right hon. Baronet proposed to transfer this property compulsorily from one set of persons to another, with all the safeguards and precautions, he presumed, with which Parliament had so sedulously surrounded the compulsory transfer of property; and he had never heard that that process had the advantage of being very rapid, expeditious, or cheap. Under the present system it was in the power of the managers to withdraw the school from the work of public elementary education, and the

Amendment sought to render the consequent cost and inconvenience impossible. The right hon. Baronet had uttered a certain number of [perfectly sound observations on the intrinsic justice of compulsory purchase for a great public object. He agreed with him entirely. That House had long ago laid it down that in the case of a public necessity, compulsory expropriation on fair terms was perfectly legitimate; but the right hon. Baronet recommended this plan because he thought it was a cheap method, and that these schools could be handed over at a relatively trifling price to the public for the purposes of education, because the existing voluntary schools were not in purely private ownership. He could not agree with him in that for he thought it was most unjust. No doubt the right hon. Baronet tried to make a point by saying that some of the trusts were intended to relieve the ratepayers of some of the money they would otherwise have had to pay to the rating authority; but what bearing had that? The proper course was to give full compensation to the trustees, and to see that the money was expended on a purpose either equivalent to the trust, or in some new scheme as nearly equivalent as modern arrangements would allow. In any case, they should start with the obviously fair and simple principle, and that when they took property compulsorily — whether it be property of individuals or of trustees—full compensation should be paid according to the well-established rules laid down in the House The right hon. Baronet appeared to think that it was a sufficient reason for not paying full compensation for the compulsory taking of these schools that some of the persons who had originally subscribed in order to provide them had been actuated by the desire to evade the rating involved by the introduction of a Board school. He did not think they could look into the private motives of the original donors of the trusts. Unless history greatly deceived us, some of the most liberal donors of great benefactions in the past had been influenced by the consideration of what would happen to their souls after death. Was that motive also to be taken into account when considering the question of the amount of compensation to be given to the present owners of the trust? He did not think the right hon. Baronet would carry his principle quite so far as that. On the whole he was disposed to think that the plan of the right hon. Baronet, which threatened the equitable compulsory transfer of property from trustees to the community — even if carried out on the sound lines of compensation laid down by Parliament — would still be neither economical nor fair to the community.

MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford): I rise to order. This Amendment proposes to take property by compulsion. Is it in order to bring on an Amendment of that kind without due notice having been given to the owners?

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I rise to another point of order. Is it in order to object to an Amendment after it has been put from the Chair?

* THE CHAIRMAN: If this Amendment were accepted, the Bill would probably have to be referred to the Examiners of private Bills to see whether the notices had been complied with. But until the Amendment is inserted in the Bill I think we might go on.

(9.35.) MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.) said that the First Lord of the Treasury had very properly stated that the Amendment of his right hon. friend the Member for Berwick, raised a question of very great gravity, because it invited the Committee to consider what was the best, the most expeditious, just, and economical method of dealing with the situation which was certain to arise from the operation of the Bill when it became law. He would endeavour to satisfy the Committee that, on occasions, some more effective remedy than was supplied by the Bill, might be afforded for the difficulties which must certainly arise. What was the situation which was clearly contemplated by the terms of the Clause the Committee were now considering? The managers of a denominational school were called upon to comply with the requirements of the local education authority, which admittedly might be of an onerous character, having regard to the fact that the voluntary contributions were falling off. Therefore the situation had to be faced of a school, the managers of which were unable to put it into a state of repair so as to satisfy the local education authority, and declined to carry out the reasonable requirements of the latter in regard to extension, and to meet the wants of an increasing population. How were they going to meet that situation? As the First Lord had told the Committee, the ordinary machinery of *mandamus* was inapplicable in regard to the managers of the denominational schools; it only applied to the education authority. Therefore, they would have a Board of Managers who said, "We neither will nor can extend the school; you must take it as it stands, for we will do nothing." Now, the school as it stood was the only provision for the education of the children of the parish or district in which it was situated, and the education authority would have to accept the situation. Here was an admittedly inefficient school which could not comply with modern requirements, and the Bill of the First Lord only increased the difficulties by cutting off financial supplies; and the school as an educational organisation would become derelict. Now, what were they going to do in such circumstances? His right hon. friend the Member for Berwick said "Take over the building, and pay fair compensation for it; if you do that, you introduce the minimum of disturbance in the conduct of education in the parish." But the First Lord's proposal introduced the maximum of disturbance and expense. The children had still to be educated, because the compulsory Clauses of the former Education Acts had not been abrogated. His right hon. friend's Amendment provided for the local education authority paying a fair compensation for the school building which would then be turned into a provided school. What was the alternative that the First Lord asked the Committee to adopt? It was that the old school, having become derelict, the local education authority must provide a new one. They must buy land, build a new school, and furnish it fit to do its educational work. That would lead to friction, controversy, and educational confusion. He believed that the local education authority would rather allow the gravest inefficiency to exist in the denominational school than face the situation of calling upon the ratepayers to provide the money for the building of a new school side by side with the old building which, owing to the action of the trustees, had failed to fulfil the purposes of the elementary education for which it was originally intended. He could not understand how an injustice would be inflicted on a public body, such as the trustees of these schools, by relieving them of their public obligations on the terms of paying them a fair compensation for their property. The First Lord said the other night that that would be a form of confiscation; but he replied that they would not be dealing with private property. These schools were educational institutions, and nobody proposed to disturb them except as educational institutions. No one had a beneficial interest in them except when they were being applied for the purposes of elementary education. In all the schools of the National Society the trust deeds set forth that they had been founded for the purpose of providing elementary education, and they could not be used for any other purpose. Therefore, if that purpose were frustrated by the erection of another school, they would have a building which would become useless to anybody else. What injustice would be done in taking possession of a building which, after paying fair compensation for it, was useless for any other purpose?

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said that he held in his hand a trust deed which stated that the school building was to be used for the purpose of a Sunday school.

MR. LAWSON WALTON said that it was not suggested that the premises should not be used for every other purpose which had been put into the trust deed. But the main object for which these schools had been erected was the provision of elementary education for the district, and, consistent with that, they were to be available for ecclesiastical purposes. The whole question between them was this—if the main object for which these schools had been erected became incapable of enforcement because the duties had been undertaken by the State, and the trustees had been relieved of their obligations, what injustice was done to the trustees? The Member for Berwick, in his anxiety to deal fairly with the owners, had said that in such cases they should have fair compensation, and if the transfer interfered with the use of the school for Church purposes, the Church would get compensation for any disturbance, but the trustees could get no compensation because the school had been taken over and applied to the purposes of elementary education. Surely the proper course in the case contemplated was for the local education authority to come in and carry on the education.

MR. CRIPPS said he would not follow the hon. and learned Member into a dissertation on principles of compensation. He objected to the whole principle. If he had his way he would fine the owners of schools who handed them over from the denominational to the undenominational system. His interest was to preserve the denominational system, and, in his opinion, it would be a monstrous thing in a Bill, which had nothing to do with the transfer of property, to introduce, by a side wind, a proposal which would enable denominational schools to be handed over to the new local education authority. That was absolutely alien to the whole principle of the Bill, and if such a proposal were included in it in the first instance, he should have opposed it, quite irrespective of any question of compensation at all. There would be absolutely sufficient sanction under the Bill, because not only the Education Department but the local authority could refuse grants. He protested *toto cœlo* against the notion of denominational owners being tempted under any scheme of compensation to get rid of their duties and obligations, and giving up the great principle of denominational education. He did not believe they would be so tempted, but he objected to the whole principle from beginning to end.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said the discussion illustrated the difficulty which arose when they were called upon to discuss questions such as that before the Committee without having the trust deeds before them. He was glad, however to know that the Return of trust deeds would be in the hands of hon. Members no Saturday morning. Six millions of money had been expended on these school buildings, and of that amount £1,500,000 had been contributed by the State. To that extent, therefore, the buildings were public property already. It was a fundamental condition in all cases where a building grant was given that there should be a trust deed, declaring that the premises were to be granted in trust for the education of the children of the poor, and for no other purpose whatever. Through the courtesy of the First Lord of the Treasury he had received an advance proof of the Return which was to be presented, and he saw that the trust deed in that Return contained, in most specific terms, the condition to which he referred. There could, therefore, be no compensation at all to private persons. He wished to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether there was anything in the regulations of the Department requiring, as a condition of a grant, that the building, when not used by the trustees for elementary school purposes, might be acquired by other persons without any rent being paid at all.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division had argued against the Amendment as if it were a proposal to transfer all the denominational schools to the undenominational system. That was not the proposal at all. The proposal was that where denominational trustees failed to carry out their trust, there should be a transfer subject to fair compensation. His right hon. friend the Member for the Berwick Division simply asked that there should be sanction for the purpose of carrying out the objects set before the country by the Government in their Bill. The Prime Minister said that a sanction was provided in the local authority, who could order the schoolmaster to carry out certain objects of the Bill. Surely one of the most important objects was to put the building into good order and repair. How was the schoolmaster to carry that object out? Suppose the school building was in an insanitary condition, was the schoolmaster to lay fresh drains; and if he did, who was to pay for them—the local authority or the managers; and if the managers, what means would there be of enforcing the debt? There was really no sanction at all at the present moment, except one which the Prime Minister deprecated, namely, the withdrawal of the grants from the school, and starving education in that particular district. It was said that the local authority might build a school of their own, but that would take eighteen months or two years, especially as every petty question was to be submitted to the Board of Education. That was the condition of things, and nothing would be done unless some such suggestion as that of his right hon. friend were put into operation. What fair compensation was, was a fair subject for discussion, and was an important part of the Amendment. It was clear that the controversy was not going to end with the Bill. They were only at the beginning of it, and, therefore, it was just as important that they should lay before the House of Commons and the country their views as to the right and proper settlement to be adopted as it was for the Government to place their views before the country. He did not understand his hon. and learned friend the Member for South Leeds to suggest that no compensation of any sort or kind should be given to the trustees. He should have been very sorry if his hon. and learned friend had taken that line. The schools were not merely for the education of the children of the poor; they were schools for the education of the children of the poor in the principles of the Church of England, but were not purely Church of England trusts. There were two objects attached to them. There was, first of all, the education of the children of the poor in the principles of the Church of England, and the second object was purely parochial. He thought, therefore, the Committee was entitled to take both objects into account in settling the principle of compensation. He had no doubt that many contributions had been given for purely Anglican and Church motives, but probably the majority of the contributions had been given in order to provide a local school. The Charity Commissioners investigated some of these cases in Wales recently, and in one case it was found that Nonconformists contributed in order to set up a parochial school, and they had no notion whatever that it would be converted into a Church school. A trust was not created by its subscribers, but by the man who gave the land; and as the land was generally given by an Anglican landowner the result was that he more or less dominated the trust. Therefore, a large number of schools which would otherwise have been parochial became, by this means, purely denominational. He thought that was a fair account of what had happened. The Prime Minister said that they were not entitled to inquire into the motives of those who created the trust. He did not agree. He thought the learned Attorney General would admit that the motives of the testator played a very important part in the interpretation of any trust. The Prime Minister instanced the case of a man who gave property to create a trust to have prayers said for his soul. There were many cases of that kind. For instance, one Thomas Smith provided a fund for masses for his soul. Surely they were entitled to take that into account if the property were confiscated. It was the very party who confiscated property for their own purposes, and who destroyed trusts, who denounced them as confiscators when they proposed to use property of that kind for public purposes. He did not think the Prime Minister had dealt with the matter as it ought to have been dealt with. The Amendment was the only possible way out of the difficulty. They would have to settle all these difficulties eventually by taking over the schools. Merely sending disputes to be settled by the Board of Education without having any authority to carry its decisions out would not be sufficient. The Church could not possibly keep the schools in a state of efficiency. They were in a very bad state of repair; they were exceedingly inefficient; and it would cost an enormous sum to put them into proper repair. It was therefore in the interests of education that an Amendment of the kind proposed by his right hon. friend should be introduced into the Bill. Further, he thought that such an Amendment would be very useful from the point of view of the inspectors of the Board of Education. He thought that, to a certain extent, the inspectors were not doing their duty rigidly with regard to these schools, as the only result of that would be to transfer them to the undenominational system. Rather than face that prospect the inspectors preferred not to report bad and inefficient schools; but if they knew that the result would be that fair compensation would be given, he believed that hundreds of these schools would be condemned, and the system of education considerably improved and strengthened throughout the country. He would therefore support the Amendment of his right hon. friend.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said that the local authority would have to buy land to build the new school which would replace the old one. In many places, all the land belonged to one person, who might be a very strong sectarian, and the existing school might belong to his sect. Suppose he refused to sell the land——

MR. A. J. BALFOUR was understood to say that he could be compelled to sell.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said that answered his question.

(10.10.) Question proposed—

Committee divided:—Ayes, 85; Noes, 176. (Division List, No. 450.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P., Glouc. (Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hon. C. R. (North'nts
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, Jn. Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manc'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Beresford, Lord Charles Wm.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Colston, Chas. Edwd. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Digby, John K. D. (Wingfield)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson

Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. Vickery (St. Albans
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hamilton, Rt Hn L'rd G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry, Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
MacIver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herbt. Pike (Darlington
Peel, Hon. Wm. Rbt. Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (N'rth'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edwd. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Ox. Univ.)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Williams, Rt Hn J. Powell- (Birm
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the Amendment which he wished to move had for its main object the carrying out of the view which was indicated in the Amendment accepted by the Committee a few days ago that the teaching profession should be thrown open in its early stages more widely to persons of all denominations. Where there were more candidates for the post of pupil teacher than there were places to be filled, the appointment should be made by the local education authority, and they should determine the respective qualifications of the candidates by examination or otherwise. He thought the Amendment would commend itself to the Committee, and he hoped it would be accepted.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 29, at the end, to insert the words, '(3) In any case in which there are more candidates for the post of pupil teacher than there are places to be filled, the appointment shall be made by the local education authority, and they shall determine the respective qualifications of the candidates by examination or otherwise.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said that this Amendment was a most disappointing one. During the autumn, announcements were made, which he supposed would now be regarded as entirely unofficial, to the effect that the Government intended dealing very liberally indeed with the general public with reference, at any rate, to the lower grades of the teaching profession. They were led to believe that while the Government would insist on the appointment of the head teacher being reserved to the denomination, the appointment of assistant teachers and pupil teachers would be thrown open.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked who said that.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS said he was referring to statements constantly made all over the country.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: By whom?

*Mr. HERBERT LEWIS said they were made by newspapers and different gentlemen, amongst whom the Member for Oxford University, now Secretary of the Board of Education, had advocated throwing open the lower grades of the teaching profession, but he supposed that they would now be regarded as unofficial in every way. They were given to understand that the appointment of assistant teacher, as well as that of pupil teacher, would be thrown open. How had that general expectation been met? The appointment of pupil teacher was not to be placed entirely in the hands of the local education authority. What would happen? He would take the case of a populous parish with which he was well acquainted, and which contained a very large number of Nonconformists. In that parish not one single pupil teacher had been appointed from the ranks of Nonconformity for twenty-five years, although the schools were attended by hundreds of Nonconformist children. In that parish the majority of the local managers would in the future, as in the past, be clerical. The First Lord of the Treasury said some time ago that that would be practically impossible; but it would be more than possible in the parish to which he was referring, and when vacancies in the post of pupil teachers were to be filled it would be quite possible for the local managers to arrange that they should be quietly filled without any competition at all. What provision was there in the Bill for advertising such vacancies. If the vacancies were not advertised, what could be easier than for the managers, who would naturally desire to keep the appointments in their own hands, to fill them up themselves? The hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment said that what the Government wished was to throw open the teaching profession in its earliest stages as widely as possible, and it was in order to enable the Government to carry out that intention that he would move the Amendment standing in his name, which was to omit all the words from the beginning to the word "the" in line 2. There would be no difficulty at all in the local authority, if they thought fit, delegating the appointment to the managers, but his Amendment would confer upon them the very necessary power of seeing that every possible opportunity was given to those who might become candidates to hear of the vacancies and to be fairly dealt with. He ventured to commend the Amendment to the Government as a reasonable and necessary one, if the objects of the Secretary of the Board of Education were to be carried out.

(10.35.) Amendment proposed to the Amendment—

"In line 1, to leave out from the beginning, to the word 'the' in line 2."—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

The CHAIRMAN proceeded to put the Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. WHITLEY on a point of order said that if the question were put in that form it would exclude the Amendment which he had on the Paper, which proposed to leave out the word "pupil" in line 1, in order to insert "assistant". He asked if the question could not be put down to the word "of" in line 1.

*The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I cannot do that. The Amendment of the hon. Member would re-open the question of the appointment of teachers, and that is concluded.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that, unless his memory deceived him, he thought the question that all teachers, except head teachers, should be appointed irrespective of denomination, had been already discussed.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the only point decided in regard to assistant teachers was that they could be appointed without any reference to creed at all, notwithstanding the trust deeds; but nothing was decided as to who should appoint the assistant teachers. The point his hon. friend wished to submit was that the whole of the lower grade of the teaching profession, not merely the pupil teachers, should be included.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he would submit that the matter had been already decided. Sub-Section (*c*) provided that—

> "The consent of the local education authority shall be required to the appointment of teachers, but that consent shall not be withheld except on educational grounds."

They had, therefore, decided that head and assistant teachers were to be appointed in that way, and he submitted that it would be out of order to attempt now to overrule that provision.

MR. WHITLEY said he submitted that in that case the Amendment of the Government was also out of order. If they had decided the question of assistant teachers they had also decided the question of pupil teachers.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think a distinction has already been drawn between teachers, assistant teachers, and pupil teachers. The appointment of teachers has been decided, but the appointment of assistant teachers has, I think, not been decided. Therefore, the hon. Member for Halifax is in order. The trouble has really arisen because of the hon. Member not having given proper notice of his Amendment. I will put the question down to the word "of" in line 1.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) asked if he understood the ruling of the Chair to be that the word "teachers" in sub-Section (*c*) only applied to head teachers?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he would submit, on a point of order, that the expression "teachers" in sub-Section (*c*) included assistant teachers, as well as head teachers. It was certainly discussed on that basis. Pupil teachers were really not teachers at all; they were only learners.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must say it does not seem to me to be very clear.

SIR JOHN GORST said he would submit, on a point of order, that the word "teachers" in sub-Section (*c*) must include, not only head teachers, but also assistant teachers and pupil teachers, because in a subsequent part of the sub-Section, it was provided that assistant teachers and pupil teachers might be appointed in a particular way. Therefore, it had been practically decided by the Committee already that teachers of all kinds should be appointed by the managers.

*THE CHAIRMAN: In that case what is the object of the Amendment?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that on the Chairman's ruling, his Amendment appeared to be out of order. He was sorry.

MR. BRYCE submitted that the Amendment was in order, as it applied to a case where there were more candidates than there were places to fill. It was a proviso which would be added to the general statement.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said the definition Clause provided that any expression to which a special meaning was attached should have the same meaning in this Act as in the Act of 1870. In the definition Clause of the Act of 1870 the term "teachers" included assistant teachers, pupil teachers, and so on.

MR. WHITLEY said that there was nothing in Clause 8 which gave the appointment of the teachers to any one. It dealt with the consent of the appointment, but there was not a single word to show by whom the appointment was to be made. His Amendment dealt with the giving of the appointment of a certain class of teachers to the local authority.

*THE CHAIRMAN: As I have already pointed out, there is nothing in the Bill which directly gives the appointment of teachers. It is clear, I think, on looking at the definition Clause of the Act of 1870, that the word "teachers" includes assistant teachers and pupil teachers. Therefore we have reached this point, that the consent of the local authority must now be required to the appointment of pupil teachers. Then what is to happen if there were more candidates than one? This Amendment suggests means of ascertaining which of those candidates are to be appointed and the decision is to be taken, not by the managers, but by the local education authority. Therefore I think the Amendment is in order. I will only put the words down to "pupil."

MR. DISRAELI (Cheshire, Altrincham) asked, if sub-Section (*c*) governed the appointment of teachers, did not that also carry with it the question as to who should appoint them?

*THE CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily. This Amendment says that if there are two or more candidates then certain things are to happen. It may be that if there is only one candidate the appointment may be made by the managers under sub-Section (*c*), subject to the confirmation of the local education authority; but if there are two or more candidates then another state of things will arise.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said if the opening words were omitted, as proposed by the hon. Member, they would have the provision as to the appointment of pupil teachers, pure and simple, which had already been dealt with.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS said that the question his right hon. friend had raised was perfectly clear. It was that sub-Section (*c*) drew a distinction between head teachers on the one hand, and assistant and pupil teachers on the other, and that it did not deal in any way with the actual appointment of either assistant teachers or pupil teachers.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think the real solution of the difficulty is that the Amendment suggested by the hon. Member for Flint Boroughs is out of order, because he proposes something that is already in the Bill, namely, that the appointment of the pupil teachers must be subject to the consent of the local authority. I think the hon. Member for Halifax will be in order if he proposes to insert the words "assistant and" before the word "pupil."

MR. BOND (Nottingham, E.) reminded the Committee that sub-Section (*c*) dealt with the appointment of teachers, and provided that the consent of the local authority should be required. The Amendment of his hon. friend now suggested that in certain instances the appointment should be made by the local authority. Surely that was inconsistent with sub-Section (*c*), because in such a case the local authority would be consenting to an appointment made by itself.

MR. WHITLEY then moved to insert "assistant and" before "pupil." He said pupil teachers were apprentices. These young people became pupil teachers before they entered the training colleges, and it would be a cruel hardship if the Government said to this large class of civil servants, "We will accept you as apprentices, we will take you after examination on your merits, but after your apprenticeship you shall have no employment." That was practically what the Government would do unless they accepted his Amendment. They would admit a large class to a great profession under an entire illusion, and deny them employment after they had served their apprenticeship, practically for no wages at all, through years of drudgery. Moreover, while the Government proposed to throw open the apprenticeship, they were at the same time keeping closed the doors of two-thirds of the training colleges which afforded the only means by which pupil teachers could obtain the training required for their profession. Pupil teachers were simply apprentices, and he hoped soon to see the system abolished in favour of a much better way of training teachers. What possible reason could the Government have for refusing this Amendment? The protection of the headmasterships was in the hands of the managers, and if there was any sincerity in the words used in this contest——

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Which words?

MR. WHITLEY said the First Lord of the Treasury had over and over again stated that he desired to do every possible justice to Nonconformists consistent with the maintenance of the denominational character of the teaching. If those words had any real meaning, the right hon. Gentleman was bound, seeing that the managers retained the appointment of the headmasters, and thus secured the denominational character of the teaching, to concede that Amendment. Even then the provision would fall a long way short of what he considered to be justice. It was a terrible mockery of justice to hold out to half the people of the country an entrance merely to the apprenticeship, and then by tests to close the doors of the training colleges, and half the situations afterwards available, against them.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the first word 'of,' to insert the words 'assistant and.'"—(*Mr Whitley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot congratulate the hon. Member and his friends on the manner in which they have received an Amendment which undoubtedly, in full and express terms, does absolutely remove once and for ever a grievance with the reiteration of which they have stunned the Committee. I remember past debates on this subject long before the Bill was born or thought of, and a reply which the hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs made to me when I was explaining that the existing system of voluntary and board schools was not one as to which any section of the population had ground for complaint, and that if there were any injustice or inequality in it that defect existed on both sides. The hon. Member got up and said that that was all very well; Churchmen, Roman Catholics, and Wesleyans might suffer under the board school system, but, on the other hand, the Nonconformists suffered under the single school Church system, and there was one grievance that no one could deny, viz., the pupil-teacher grievance, which we now absolutely remove.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I said the teacher grievance.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, the pupil-teacher grievance. One has only to look at the literature on the subject to see the pupil teachers over and over again used as the great stalking horse of Nonconformist grievance. [Several voices from the OPPOSITION: "And the teachers."] That is another grievance.

MR. TREVELYAN: This is the first time you have recognised it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I did not say I agreed it was a grievance. Are we not to be allowed to deal with one thing at a time? This is a specific grievance, different from the other grievance and wholly separate from it. It has always been treated as separate from it, and has figured in the controversy as separate from it. [Cries of "No."] We bring forward an Amendment dealing with it completely and absolutely, and then, after some observations by a Welsh Member—to whose speech I will not further allude as his Amendment has been ruled out of order—an hon. Member representing a Yorkshire constituency gets up and says that not only does he not admit that this grievance, which has been constantly alleged, has been dealt with, but that the Amendment makes the situation worse than it ever was, and it is a mere mockery.

MR. WHITLEY: I did not say that it made the situation worse than it was, but I did say that it was a mockery.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I did not use any words such as the right hon. Gentleman has suggested.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If I misrepresented the hon. Gentleman I am sorry, but the hon. Member for Halifax said that unless the provision is extended to those learning and those practising the profession we are guilty of nothing short of mockery. Just consider what this Bill does for the teaching profession and for the Nonconformist portion of it. For the first time it enables the local authority to provide secondary education for Nonconformists; for the first time it enables the education authority to provide training colleges for Nonconformist teachers; for the first time it thrusts aside the trust deeds of voluntary schools so that Nonconformists can be elected to all posts except the headmastership; it demolishes the Nonconformist grievance; and yet, with all that, hon. Gentlemen object that it is a mockery, knowing all the time that if they came into power tomorrow they could do nothing to reform the existing system. After all, I have done my best with this Bill, largely with a view to remedying Nonconformist grievances. I quite grant that I never anticipated gratitude from Nonconformist politicians. I admit I have not got it; but, however that may be, I hope the House will pursue the policy which the Government have indicated, and that they will remove those grievances completely without confusing them with an entirely different question.

(11.5.) Mr. BRYCE did not desire to imitate the somewhat unnecessary heat which the right hon. Gentleman had introduced into a debate which had been singularly pacific and conducted with good humour on both sides. He wished to point out why the right hon. Gentlemen and the Ministry must not expect what the right hon. Gentleman called gratitude.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not expect it.

Mr. BRYCE: The right hon. Gentleman admitted that he did expect it, because he spoke in a tone of disappointment.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: There is a medium between gratitude and being told that what you are doing is a mockery.

Mr. BRYCE, continuing, said that if his hon. friend had used any word which had ruffled the right hon. Gentleman's susceptibilities he was doubtless sorry for it. After all, the Ministry were not there in the position of a despotic monarch who out of the plenitude of his grace threw down favours to his helpless subjects. The Opposition were there as British citizens. They considered that the system of education which had gone on in this country from 1870 was one which ought never to have been admitted or tolerated by the Nonconformists. It had been a standing injustice to them, and they considered that this injustice was aggravated by the Bill, and that all the concessions, so called, made did not in their totality amount to anything like the additional injury which was inflicted upon those who objected to sectarian schools by being required to support them out of the rates. That being so, there was no question whatever of any spirit of submissive gratitude and obligation.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON reminded the right hon. Gentleman that in moving the Amendment he made no suggestion of either concession or gratitude. What he said was that it would serve two purposes—first, to open the teaching profession more widely than before; secondly, to put into the hands of the local authority the means of beginning a system in the general organisation of the training of teachers.

Mr. BRYCE said he was not referring to the words of the hon. Gentleman, who no doubt introduced the Amendment in the best possible spirit. He rose simply because the Prime Minister's language betrayed a misconception of the feeling with which the Bill was regarded by the Opposition, and as to the way in which they ought to conduct the discussion. They were there as Members of the House of Commons, all having equal rights, representing constituencies with equal rights, and they would debate the Bill with a view to what they believed to be the best interests of the country.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said he did not know what had ruffled the Prime Minister. Apparently he did not mind being opposed by Wales alone or by Yorkshire alone, but what he objected to very much was a combination of Wales and Yorkshire. He agreed with his right hon. friend that they had no cause to be grateful for this Bill, but if the right hon. Gentleman would indicate to him what was a happy medium between an allegation of mockery on the one hand and an expression of gratitude on the other he would be glad to take that line. What was the Amendment? It seized upon an admission of the Government that hereafter they had a right to expect that the pupil teachers should be elected by the local authority in certain events, and the Opposition wanted to know what was the difference in this matter between pupil teachers and assistant teachers. Nonconformists could no longer hope in the future to secure the position of head teacher in denominational schools. With regard to the position of every other teacher, he contended that Nonconformists ought to be as eligible as any other section of the community. It was a very extraordinary thing, but his hon. and learned friend the Attorney-General had stated that a pupil teacher was not a teacher at all. It had been said that the pupil teacher system now in vogue was destined to be destroyed very soon. He was rather inclined to think that the late Vice-President of the Council was a greater influence outside the Government than in it, and the right hon. Gentleman had never concealed his opinion that the pupil teacher system in this country was an evil and ought to be destroyed as soon as possible. If the present pupil teacher system was about to come to an end, what was the value of the Amendment of the Government as a concession to Nonconformists? This Amendment was only allowing Nonconformists to have the appointment of something which was going to vanish very shortly. What was the use of an Amendment of that description? If they were establishing a scheme for pupil teachers as a permanent part of their educational system, then, of course, this Amendment would be some extension of the rights which Nonconformists could properly demand. But when they said that the present system was an evil one, what in the name of goodness was the meaning of an Amendment when the system would soon come to an end? The Amendment was to the effect that assistant teachers should be appointed in the same way as the pupil teachers. The hon. Member for Somerset stated that in order to preserve the denominational character of the schools, they ought to keep in the hands of the denomination the appointment of the head teacher. Would hon. Gentlemen opposite like to be told that in all the other schools in the country Churchmen would be disqualified from being assistant teachers? The general system might be divided in two parts, namely, the Anglican schools and the board schools. This Bill sought to exclude from every position in the denominational schools anybody who was not a member of the Church of England. How would hon. Gentlemen opposite like that kind of justice meted out to them, and be told that no member of the Church of England was entitled to come in as teacher in a board school? Every argument that could be adduced in favour of the Amendment of the Secretary to the Board of Education could be used with equal force in favour of the Amendment of his hon. friend. Under these circumstances he thought they had an absolute right to demand that in denominational schools they should throw open the teaching profession, with the exception of the head teacher, without reference to any denomination.

MR. TREVELYAN said the Prime Minister had stated that he could not congratulate the Opposition upon the way in which they had received this supposed concession. He thought they had a right to retort that they could not congratulate the right hon. Gentleman upon the way he had received the Amendment of his hon. friend. He thought the Amendment deserved more attention than the First Lord of the Treasury had given to it, because it had an episcopal origin—it was the proposal of the Bishop of Hereford. Although this was an Amendment which they did not regard as entirely satisfactory, yet it had the support of a large number of people outside the House. Although a great many people agreed that the head teacher ought to be appointed by the denomination, yet they held the opinion that the assistant teachers ought to be appointed by the local authority. Not only had the Amendment of his hon. friend an episcopal origin, but it also had the Birmingham *imprimatur* upon it. At the Liberal Unionist Conference in Birmingham amongst the questions put by the Colonial Secretary was "With a view of safeguarding religious instruction are you ready to leave the election of the head teacher in the hands of the managers?" That obviously meant that the appointment of the assistant teachers should be in the hands of somebody else. The supporters of the Colonial Secretary voted by an immense majority in favour of that proposal. Therefore this Amendment should not be treated with such scant courtesy as not to have a word said about it by the Premier, and he might at least have treated an Amendment which had the sanction of the Colonial Secretary, and which, he believed, had the sanction of more than one bishop, with some respect.

*(11.20.) MR. LUCAS (Portsmouth) said there was an old saying that "What Lancashire thinks today, England will think tomorrow." It seemed to him to be the opposite in regard to this debate, for it appeared that what Wales and Yorkshire thought today, England thought yesterday. He had listened to the debate with great interest, and his opinion, from what had taken place, was that hon. Members opposite were endeavouring inch by inch, and bit by bit, to rob the voluntary schools of that authority which it was intended in the original draft of the Bill to give them. The right hon. Baronet the member for the Berwick Division this afternoon made a speech which was intended to make a very serious inroad into the rights which still remained under the Bill to the voluntary schools. He thought it was only proper that some hon. Member on this side should stand up and assert that voluntary schools should not be robbed, as it seemed to him they were being robbed, of their rights. From the drift of the speeches which had been made by hon. Gentlemen opposite their one effort appeared to be to take away from the voluntary schools such privileges as the Bill would give them. The tendency of the Bill as originally introduced was to leave considerable powers with the managers, but as the debate went on the growing tendency seemed to be to take away powers from the managers and hand them over to the local authority. A large number of people in the country were watching this Bill very carefully. He did not presume to dictate to the House, or to speak as an expert upon educational matters, but he thought it was well that from time to time ordinary Members of the House should stand up and express the views of their constituents just to

show that they were there, and let the Committee know that they were pledged to represent the interests of voluntary schools and they ought not by their silence to allow those interests to suffer without an occasional protest. In making these persistent attempts to rob voluntary schools of their rights and their privileges hon. Gentlemen oppiteos were bringing forward grievances which had never been heard of before. Many hon. Members sitting on the Ministerial side of the House did not wish to waste time by intervening too frequently in the debate, but he thought it was their duty to let the Government know that they objected to voluntary schools being handed over lock, stock, and barrel to the local authority.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the hon. Member for Portsmouth had just informed the Committee that they were hearing now for the first time of some Nonconformist grievances. Even the Prime Minister had admitted this evening that there was a grievance in reference to pupil teachers years ago. He wished to ask the Prime Minister if he had just been out to look the matter up.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, I have not.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he had some hope that before the Prime Minister left office he would have an opportunity of dealing with the larger Nonconformist grievances. He invited the right hon. Gentleman to deal with those grievances now because he did not think he would have much of an opportunity later on. The Prime Minister said that Nonconformists had no grievances at all after those concessions had been made, and he stated that this Bill had been introduced in order to remedy Nonconformist grievances. It was a very extraordinary thing that this Bill should be exactly on the lines of the demands made not by the Free Church Council but by Convocation. Consequently, they were in this extraordinary position—that the real exponents of Nonconformist views were not the Free Church Council but the Archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops and clergy in Convocation assembled. He could quite understand why the Prime Minister mistook the Nonconformist view, for it was because he went to the wrong quarter. He assured the Prime Minister that the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich was not the exponent or the advocate of Free Church principles. With regard to the combination referred to between Wales and Yorkshire he might be allowed to point out that a similar union existed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries when they were supposed to be the best singers, and they had kept up their reputation in this respect up to the present day. [An HON. MEMBER: "Yes, you have."] Just as they were in harmony then with Yorkshire then they were in harmony on this Bill. His hon. friend had said that the Amendment put forward by the Government was a pure mockery, and he had no hesitation in supporting that statement. Suppose they had at Sandhurst the whole system of cadets thrown open to every creed? [An HON. MEMBER: "That is so at present."] Suppose they laid it down that two-thirds of the commissions in the Army should be confined to members of a particular creed, would it not be a mockery after that to throw open the places for cadets to all denominations? One had almost to apologise in the House of Commons for mentioning Wales, but Welshmen had to pay rates like anybody else. [AN HON. MEMBER: "But you say you will not pay the education rate."] Yes, but the Government had got to collect that rate. How would this proposal operate in Wales? In the country which he represented there were ninety schools in which Nonconformist children could serve their apprenticeships. According to this proposal Nonconformist children could serve in the whole of those ninety schools, but when their time was finished eighty of those schools would say to them, "Oh, you cannot come here," and there would only be ten schools out of the ninety in which they could utilise their services. [AN HON. MEMBER: They are not obliged to stick to one county."] Practically the hon. Member opposite said, "Let them go elsewhere; drive them out of their own county." [AN HON. MEMBER: "What about Halifax?"] At Halifax they had a very liberal system, under which even the hon. Member who interrupted would be treated fairly. The present proposal was a perfectly unfair system, and from the point of view of the State it was a mockery to say that these pupil teachers were to be trained at the expense of the State and then to say that in two-thirds of the schools in the land "No Nonconformists need apply.' They might even be better teachers, but nevertheless they were going to say to them, "We have no need of your services because of your creed." That was the way the Government proposed to deal with this question, and then the Prime Minister complained that Nonconformists were not grateful for such concessions. The right hon. Gentleman said that if the Opposition came into power they could not have done this wonderful thing, but let the Government give them the chance. If the right hon. Gentleman had any doubt on this question let him submit this Bill for the redress of Nonconformist grievances to the judgment of the country. In this case he could not offer the electors an extra shilling a day, as was done at Devonport. The Secretary to the Board of Education, upon the second reading of this Bill, said he was in favour of throwing open the lower grades of the teaching profession to everybody without distinction of creed. Did the hon. Gentleman adhere to that view now? If he did, then he ought to support the Amendment of his hon. friend the Member for Halifax. Did the Secretary to the Board of Education agree that it was a right and just thing to extend this privilege to the lower grades of the teaching profession? If so, what did he say about the charge brought by the Prime Minister against the Nonconformists because they had moved an Amendment which was the very proposal suggested by the Secretary to the Board of Education.

MR. BOND: The charge was that his proposal was a mockery.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: So it was, and there was nothing which proved it more conclusively than the statement made by the hon. Member himself. This was not the first time in the course of these discussions that the Nonconformist grievances had been admitted, but although they were admitted the Government said they would not remedy them. That was because there were hon. Members to remind them of the forces behind who desired to take another course.

(11.36.) LORD HUGH CECIL said the hon. Member in his interesting speech made use of an ingenious analogy between pupil teachers in schools and army cadets. It did not occur to him that a much more appropriate analogy was to be drawn between army chaplains and the teachers who gave religious instruction in schools. At any rate they had this in common, that both were teachers of religion. No one supposed that it was a grievance to any of the denominations concerned that they could not hold the chaplaincies attached to the other denomination, although the whole fabric and pay was borne by the State. No Nonconformist said "What a shame that I can't be a Church of England chaplain." [AN HON. MEMBER: "They are not trained by the State."] What difference did that make? They were paid by the State. Hon. Members were all agreed about pupil teachers. Every teacher of religion must be to some extent under restriction. He must be a person deemed suitable to teach religion. They could not escape from it in an undenominational school, except by admitting a very much worse evil, if they escaped at all. In a denominational school religion avowedly Christian was taught. How could they admit to a school to teach Christianity a person who rejected Christianity? If they did it would be an intolerable grievance to those who sent their children to the school and who believed that they were being brought up in Christianity by persons who believed in that religion. The only real logical result of the hon. Member's speech was to have simply a secular system and have no religious teaching at all. Would the hon. Member go to the country on that issue? He must shrink from that alternative.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have always said that in this House.

LORD HUGH CECIL said his complaint was that knowing a secular system was impossible, and that they must have a religious system, hon. Members opposite tried to make cheap capital about religious tests. Everybody knew that if they had a religious system they must have tests. If hon. Members opposite wished to abolish tests they must go in for a secular system, and if so, they ought to spare the Committee the rhetoric which they had inflicted. That was his answer to the hon. Gentleman. The object of the Government was not to exalt one denomination at the expense of another. They were asked on this side how they should themselves like to submit to such a test. They should receive it with absolute enthusiasm. If the hon. Member for Carnarvon would get up and propose a denominational system he should be one of his warmest supporters. The fact was that the teachers existed for the children, and not the children for the teachers. Therefore every consideration must stand on one side where the welfare of the children was concerned, and it was for that reason that they had all along supported not merely the denominational character of their schools but the denominational character of the teachers in these schools. It was on that ground that they had brought forward the Bill and on which they would go to the country.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs) hoped the Prime Minister after his warm speech would reconsider the matter and try to accept the Amendment. Many hon. Members sent their sons to our public schools where there were Nonconformists as under masters. As they did that, why should they not consent to have Nonconformists as well as Conformists as assistant teachers in all schools maintained from rates and taxes throughout the country. He would give one out of several instances of Nonconformists being under masters at our great public schools. Now, at Rugby for some years, Mr. Paton, a Nonconformist, was one of their under masters; he is now head master of University College School. Further, he was informed that in our public schools, under masters were elected without any reference to religion. Is this opposition to the Amendment, therefore, real on the part of some Members? It was an unjust Bill, and it was impossible to make it acceptable to Nonconformists unless it could be completely changed from beginning to end. Did the Tory Party remember the time when a Bill, unacceptable to them, was before the House, they said, "Ulster will fight, Ulster will be right." Nonconformists were too patriotic to fight with the sword, but they would protest against the Bill in every way possible. The Prime Minister was so amiable at the Welsh dinner the other day, that he confidently ventured to appeal to him to mete out justice to the majority of the people outside the State Church in the matter of education. If the Prime Minister's amiability could be assured on all occasions, he ventured to believe that they would cheerfully entertain him once a week instead of once in six years. Nonconformists only wanted their just rights. He hoped the House would consider whether it would not be an act of justice to the people of this land to allow the best assistant teachers to be appointed without any reference to State Church religion.

(11.43.) Question put.

Committee divided:—Ayes, 85; Noes, 197. (Division List No. 451.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cremer, William Randal
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Duncan, J. (Hastings)
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. (Leicester)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Morgan J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James

Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Ld. Charles William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carlile, William Walter
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hon J A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Fredrick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh'm
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar, (Glasgow
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J. (W'lthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff. R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Skewes-Cox, Thomas

Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir. William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said he wished to move the Amendment standing in his name as follows—

> "In page 3, line 29, at end, to insert—'Religious instruction shall be given in a school not provided by the local education authority, in accordance with the tenour of the provisions (if any) of the trust deed relating thereto, and shall be under the control of the managers.'"

The hon. and gallant Gentleman said there was not time at that hour to enter into a detailed explanation of the objects of the Amendment. [Cries of "Progress."] He was perhaps entitled to ask that Progress be reported.

After a brief consultation with the right hon. Gentleman on the Treasury Bench,

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY, who spoke amid cries of "Progress," said the Amendment had certain objects which he thought would appeal to the Committee.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs), intervening: Really, Sir, the House of Commons is being played with. My hon. and gallant friend must do one thing or the other. He must move his Amendment or move to report Progress. But, as a matter of fact, he is doing both.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY: Well Sir, I have an exceedingly good precedent for taking more courses than one.

It being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress.

To sit again Tomorrow.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Preamble.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this be the Preamble of the Bill."

Committee report Progress.

To sit again Tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 31*st October*, 1902.

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House, at the rising of the House this day, do adjourn till Monday next.—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Tantobie; Port Glasgow; Surbiton; Mansfield; and East Kirkby; to lie upon the Table.

CLUBS REGISTRATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Baptist Union of Scotland, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Hull; and Ashwater; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Tantobie; Honley; Surbiton; Mansfield; Kirkby in Ashfield; and Edinburgh; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Ashton-in-Makerfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petitions for legislation: from Tantobie; Honley; Surbiton; and Mansfield; to lie upon the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA (BRITISH INDIAN SUBJECTS IN THE TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONY).

Petition from London, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY TRADING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition of the Baptist Union of Scotland, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND *v.* ANDERSON AND OTHERS.

Petition of Charles Gibbons May, Solicitor, of 49, Lincoln's Inn Fields, praying for leave for the proper officer to attend at the High Court of Justice, and produce documents.

Leave given to the proper officer to attend accordingly.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

POLICE (METROPOLIS).

Copy presented, of Report of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis for the year 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).

Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 30th September, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 30th October; Mr. Hayes Fisher]; to lie upon the Table.

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House:—

CHARITABLE ENDOWMENTS (LONDON).

Further Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August, 1894; Mr. Francis Stevenson]; to be printed. [No. 364.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Military Hospital Accommodation at Shorncliffe.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to a contemplated isolation hospital for infectious cases contiguous to the military hospital at Shorncliffe, and close to the main road from Hythe to Sandgate; and whether, in view of the injury that will be inflicted upon the inhabitants of those districts, he will consider the expediency of establishing such an institution on another site.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The whole question of hospital accommodation at Shorncliffe is under consideration; the point raised by my hon. friend will be borne in mind when deciding upon final sites for the buildings.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Rating of Crown Property.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the total valuation of Crown property in England, Ireland, and Scotland respectively, and the total amount of Treasury bounty in lieu of rates paid thereon, the amount withheld from any and what local authority in the three kingdoms, in consequence of the Brockley Park decision; and why, as the Crown are not liable to pay rates on any property, this decision has been availed of to repudiate liability in respect of contributions to rates for royal parks, which were never rateable; will he state what new legal principle affecting rateability this case decided, which led the Treasury into withholding contributions for royal parks; and why were the responsible law officers of the Crown in the three kingdoms not consulted before the Treasury undertook to decide that a new legal principle affecting rateability had been laid down by the House of Lords in the Brockley Park case.

(*Answered by Mr. Hayes Fisher.*) The total valuation (rateable value) of property in the occupation of the Crown for the public service, excluding telephone trunk wires, telegraph property acquired under the Telegraph Acts, 1868 and 1869, and property in charge of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Woods and Forests, is—

	£
In England - - -	1,402,170
In Ireland - - -	171,800
In Scotland - - -	104,700

The total amount of the Treasury bounty in lieu of rates paid thereon in the year 1901–02 was—

	£
England - - - -	412,698
Ireland - - - -	47,218
Scotland - - - -	21,282

The amounts withheld from the local authorities in the three kingdoms in consequence of the Brockwell Park decision, and the local authorities from whom they were withheld are as follows:—

Amount of Contribution withheld.	Park in respect of which Contribution was withheld.	Name of Local Authority from whom Contribution was withheld.
	ENGLAND.	
£		
233	Regent's Park and Primrose Hill.	Borough Council of St. Marylebone.
16	,,	Borough Council of St. Pancras.
450	Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens	City Council of Westminster.
30	Green Park	,, ,,
19	St. James's Park	,, ,,
7	Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens	Borough Council of Paddington.
22	Greenwich Park	Borough Council of Greenwich.
5	Richmond Park	Overseers of Coombe.
5	,,	Urban District Council of Coombe.
20	,,	Overseers of Ham.
25	,,	Urban District Council of Ham.
70	,,	Overseers of Mortlake.
52	,,	Urban District Council of Barnes.
55	,,	Overseers of Petersham.
11	,,	Select Vestry of Richmond.
57	,,	Town Council of Richmond.
92	,,	Borough Council of Wandsworth.
5	Bushey Park	Overseers of Teddington.
6	,,	Urban District Council of Teddington.
	IRELAND.	
604	Phœnix Park	County Council of Dublin.
	SCOTLAND.	
20	Holyrood Park	Parish Council of Edinburgh.
28	,,	Town Council of Edinburgh.
2	Linlithgow Park	Parish Council of Linlithgow.
2	,,	Town Council of Linlithgow.

As I informed the hon. Member on the 23rd instant, the valuations of Government property are based (as far as practicable) on the same principles as the valuations of private property. Accordingly, no contributions are made in respect of parks which would not be rateable if they did not belong to the Government. For the legal principles decided I must refer the hon. Member to the reported judgment to which I have already given him a reference. As explained by my predecessor, on 29th May last, the Treasury have always reserved to themselves the right to decide in the last resort upon any disputed question regarding contributions in lieu of rates. It is their practice to take such legal advice as they may require before forming their decision. In the present case they did not consider it necessary to consult the law officers.

London Postal Sorters' Grievances.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Methyr Tydvil): To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that a memorial was submitted by the sorters of the London postal service to the Postmaster General on the 25th October, 1901, and that a reply has not yet been received by the men concerned; and whether, in view of his observations in Minute (Ireland) No. 1,703 | 02, he will consider whether an early reply can be sent to the memorialists.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The memorial has already been partially answered. The remaining portions of it shall be answered as soon as possible.

Russia and Afghanistan.

Sir SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the interests involved, and the anxiety which has been excited by the announcement that a correspondence is proceeding between the British and Russian Governments on the subject of the opening of Russian relations with Afghanistan, he can give the House an assurance that no definite arrangement will be entered into with Russia before Parliament has had an opportunity of discussing its terms.

(*Answered by Lord Cranborne.*) The question to which my hon. friend calls attention is undoubtedly a matter of much interest to the public, but it is a rule without exception that assurances such as he seeks should not be given, and to break it in this case would, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, not be for the public advantage.

Vaccination Prosecution at Bethnal Green.

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that a bicycle belonging to a resident of Green Street, Bethnal Green, which was distrained on the 30th September last for non-payment of a fine imposed on him at the Worship Street Police Court under the Vaccination Acts, was sent to a sale room at Holloway to be disposed of; and will he explain the reason of its being sent such a distance from the residence of the owner instead of being sold in the district, so as to allow of his being present at the sale.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) I am not aware that the broker entrusted with the sale of goods taken under a distress warrant is bound to select a place of sale with a view to the convenience of the owner. He is only bound to see that the sale is a fair one, and that the charges are not unreasonable. In the present case the place was the one usually used by the broker employed, and the distance (some three miles) did not apparently prevent the owner from being present, as I am informed that he attended and bought in the bicycle.

Education Bill—Pupil Teachership.

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, when a vacancy arises in a pupil teachership in a voluntary school, the managers will be under any legal obligation to make any public notification of such vacancy.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) It will be in the power of the local education authority to give directions on the subject

Irish Pharmaceutical Society.

MR. T. M. HEALY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that there is no Roman Catholic chemist from Dublin, Belfast, Cork, or Galway on the Council of the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland, which consists of twenty-one members; whether since Sir Dominic Corrigan was nominated by the Crown at the incorporation of the Society in 1875, no Roman Catholic has ever been elected president, vice-president, secretary, or treasurer; whether a Roman Catholic is or ever has been a professor or lecturer in the schools of the society; whether no Roman Catholic is or ever has been an examiner for the licence of the society, or for the qualification of registered druggist or assistant; whether, out of over 700 druggists holding the certificates of the society, only about thirty-one subscribe to assist it to enforce the Pharmacy Act; and whether the Government will consider the advisability of taking steps to modify the constitution of the society.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Government has no official knowledge of the matters alluded to in this Question. The Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland was constituted by the Act 38 and 39 Vict., c. 57, and the mode of election of members of the council and its officers, and of the appointment of examiners, is prescribed by statute and regulations issued thereunder. Religious tests are not imposed, and the Government sees no necessity for imposing them.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

(12.10.) COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) hoped that the Committee would give him a little attention while he tried to explain the Amendment which stood in his name—an Amendment which he hoped to be able to convince them was reasonable, supplying a real need in the Bill, and being consistent with its general principles and objects. What he wanted to make absolutely clear was that his Amendment was directed only to non-provided schools, hitherto known as voluntary schools, and its reference to the managers meant the whole body of managers, and not those only who might be called the denominational part of the management. His chief object was to make what was called one-man control over the religious teaching in these schools impossible in future. He desired to make it impossible for the future that any individual, whether cleric or layman, should be able to impose, of his own will, any form of religious teaching, or any practice or observance in connection with religious teaching which might not have the consent and approval of the majority of the management of the school. That was the object he had in view, and he hoped that in the discussion which would follow it would be borne constantly in mind. He would be told, he was afraid, by many whose opinions he respected very much—by many gentlemen and ladies—

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): We have no lady Members of the House at present.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said that was so; but there were means by which the opinions of ladies were brought to the notice of hon. Members. He would be told, no doubt, that the Amendment was a slight on the clergy, a slight which ought not to be levelled at them in consideration of the splendid work they had done. He should be sorry to be exposed to that charge. No one acknowledged more unreservedly or gratefully than he the splendid part played by the clergy of all denominations in the educational progress of the country. He agreed most fully that they had received scant recognition for the service they had done. People were only too apt to forget that there were several generations of our countrymen who would have received little or no education had it not been for the unselfish and constant exertions of the clergy of different denominations. He must frankly admit, however, that this Amendment was in some measure levelled at the clergy—that was to say, it was directed against the possible abuse of the powers at present possessed by certain extreme-minded men; he referred chiefly, perhaps, to those of his own Church. The great body of the clergy were absolutely trustworthy. They were the natural and rightful teachers of religion in the schools, and both the House and the public would wish them to continue in that office. That, no doubt, was the general feeling with regard to the great mass of the clergy; but that general feeling did not provide for possible exceptions, and cases might occur of what the Prime Minister had called eccentricity and extravagance. There might be cases of wrong-headedness and narrow-mindedness—there might be cases in which, even under the impulse of conscientious conviction, or even from motives of personal vanity, foolish things might be done. In such cases as those it would be possible, in existing circumstances, for an individual minister to force upon the school with which he was connected practices which would be obnoxious, and even abhorrent, not only to the public, but to the majority of the very denomination to which he belonged. He could not help recognising that the existence of any such eccentricities, or the possibility of any such conduct, was a direct menace to the continued maintenance of the Established Church. In speaking of a denomination, it was not exclusively the clergy of the denomination who were referred to. It was the whole body, both lay and clerical, that was meant. It was perfectly clear that the object of the Bill was not to magnify the position or increase the power of any individual minister, but, in so far as it dealt with denominations at all, it was to safeguard the general interests of the whole of the denominational community, both lay and clerical. He might be asked how the Amendment would work. As they knew, there would be four managers of the denomination to which the school belonged, appointed in consonance with the provisions of the trust deed which governed the school. It was not unreasonable to suppose that one of the four would be the clergyman. In addition to that, there would be two, presumably level-headed, appointed by the County Council. Under the Amendment interference with the method of religious teaching in these schools could only result from insistence by the clergyman on something which, in the opinion of the managers, three of whom were of his own denomination, ought not to be carried on. He did not think, therefore, that there was much danger of the Amendment exposing any fair-minded or rational clergyman to inconvenience. Supposing the clergyman took a rather extreme view as to the form of religious instruction, he would have to modify it and bring it into accordance with the view of the majority of the managers. That would not be a very hard thing to do. Some hon. Members thought a rather extravagant and unwise suggestion was made by those opposed to the Bill, that under certain circumstances Members would be justified in refusing to pay rates put upon them in connection with it, and he held that it would be equally foolish for a clergyman to refuse to modify his form of teaching so as to bring it in consonance with the views of the majority of the management. One great advantage of the Amendment was that it would tend to promote great simplicity of religious teaching in the schools. He was certain that in the interests of the children it was good that the religious teaching should be as simple as possible, and unconfused with any of the controversies that raged outside. They must realise that the most genuine religious feeling to be found in the country districts had a strong Puritan tinge, which was all in favour of simplicity, and the Amendment would make extravagant practices possible, unless the majority of the management agreed with them. It would also forbid the introduction into the school, for the purpose of religious teaching, of books advocating extreme doctrines which were not accepted by the majority of the managers. It would substitute for the one man judgment which now prevailed, the perhaps cooler judgment of the six members of the management. It would tend to secure, too, the rights of the laity, for in dealing with these questions too much was often made of the rights of the clergy, and too little of those of laymen. Up till now, the laity had one safeguard, inasmuch as the school had hitherto depended on voluntary subscriptions, and a supporter would seriously hamper its management by withdrawing his subscription if he were dissatisfied with what was going on. But that safeguard was largely removed by this Bill, and the Amendment was, as he said, to fortify the rights of laymen against possible clerical domination. He thought also that it would tend to remove friction. How would the Bill affect the extreme minister or clergyman who insisted on teaching the particular form of worship which he approved, or none at all? No doubt he would have to cease giving religious teaching in the school as far as it fell under the control of the managers, but he would not be debarred from the use of the school at other times, and could then conduct what classes he liked. In that respect his privileges would not be curtailed. Next, how would it affect the Roman Catholic denomination? They did not fear priestly ascendency; on the contrary, they believed it to be the best, and, if that were so, it was hard to believe that there could possibly be any Roman Catholic school which would be affected by the working of the Amendment, inasmuch as the priest would be sure of the support of the majority of the management. He could only say in regard to the Amendment that he had not himself been the recipient of any objection from any class of the community, whether clerical or lay. He had not had the advantage of hearing the opinion of the Bishops upon his Amendment, but, in so far as it would restrain ministers from doing things which would be awkward for the Bishops, he thought they would look upon it with a lenient eye. He now came to the question of trust deeds. While insisting that the general tenor of the trust deed should be acted upon, the provision would undoubtedly override any such portion of the deed as enabled the clergyman to carry on any system of religious teaching in defiance of the management. They were now entering upon a new phase of the existence of these schools, and of their relation to the country at large, and he thought, therefore, that it was not unreasonable to ask that, in regard to a trust deed which was created under a different state of things, there should be modifications in certain cases to bring them into harmony with the future situation. It could hardly be said that there was anything harsh or revolutionary in asking for such a modification. He did not think the result of the Amendment would be to debar the clergy from entry into the schools. The Amendment was an assertion, not of any desire to put a slight on the clergy, but an assertion that, whilst amply respecting the clergy, laymen intended thoroughly to safeguard their rights. He hoped that if it were accepted by the Government, it would be allowed to carry with it an absolute refutation of the charge made against the Bill that it was intended in any way to accentuate clerical control or maintain priestly ascendency. He also hoped it would be accepted as a practical if humble contribution which would render still more popular, effective, and beneficial this great measure of educational reform. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"After the words last inserted, to insert the words, 'Religious instruction shall be given in a school not provided by the local education authority, in accordance with the tenour of the provisions (if any) of the trust deed relating thereto, and shall be under the control of the managers.'"—(*Colonel Kenyon-Slaney.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*(12.35.) THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said the Amendment of his hon. and gallant friend no doubt embodied the policy which the Government had set forth on this subject, but it was desirable that things which were open to any doubt in the construction of the Bill should be clearly expressed. From the very outset, it had been laid down by the Prime Minister that the control and management of voluntary schools would be popularised, even from a denominational point of view, by insisting on having four foundation managers. It was further popularised by the addition of representatives of local authorities. The object which the Government had in view was that the managers should all work together for all the purposes which they had in common, and that religious instruction should not be excluded from those general powers of management. With that in view, the Government would be prepared to accept the Amendment of his hon. and gallant friend. He did not

think those who desired to make denominational teaching secure need have any anxiety. They would all remember the anxious and somewhat heated discussion which took place in the summer of the present year as to the majority of foundation managers which should be placed on the Board of Management, and surely all these struggles were in vain if they could not trust that majority to secure the maintenance of the denominational character of the school. For his own part, he would not have hesitated to leave the denominational teaching in the hands of the majority which had been placed on the boards of managers, but this Amendment went somewhat further in the way of security, and provided that the tenour of the teaching should be in accordance with the provisions of the trust deed. He hoped the words of the Amendment made that point perfectly explicit. There was another question as to how far the clergyman's status in his own parish would be damaged or diminished by the Amendment. Well, he belonged to a part of the United Kingdom from which neither the Prime Minister, nor the Attorney General, nor the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen who had led the opposition to the Bill, came, and he ventured to say that they hardly appreciated the fact that in that part of the kingdom called England the people did not bring a very intense dialectical acumen nor a keen theological interest to bear upon these questions of denominational teaching; indeed, the average Englishman was prepared to take his theology as he found it. The clergyman, if he were a man of ordinary tact and good humour, would not find his special province invaded by the managers who worked on the board with him. There might be cases, no doubt, when a clergyman would find a restraint put upon his action if he insisted on observances which were not in accordance with the general desires of the community. The Government were anxious that the character of the religious teaching should be secured. His hon. friend the Member for the Tonbridge Division had an Amendment on the Paper providing for the inspection of religious instruction where that was required by trust deed. He did not think the Government could accept it in the form in which it stood on the Paper, but they would be prepared to accept an Amendment which, when the provisions of the trust deed required the inspection of religious instruction by a diocesan inspector, would secure that such inspection should take place under the provisions of the Act of 1870. With that explanation he had to say that the Government were prepared to accept the Amendment of his hon. and gallant friend.

MR. VICARY GIBBS (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) said he understood from the speech of the Secretary of the Board of Education that the Government accepted the Amendment because it made their policy clearer and more explicit, but he could not help thinking that it brought greater obscurity in the Bill. It was clear that the aim of the mover of the Amendment was not simply to make the Bill clear but to secure an increase of control over the clergy. If the Amendment were accepted, would the managers have power to break a trust which placed specific powers in the hands of the parson to superintend religious instruction in the day schools? If they had not, this Amendment was mere verbiage. If they had the power of breaking the trust, why were the words of the Amendment of the hon. Member opposite watered down? Why did not this Amendment run "notwithstanding anything in the trust deed of the school"? Surely, that would be the franker and more straightforward way to deal with the question—to give the managers power to break the trust deed. He held that they should not have power to break the trust at all; but if the Government meant to give the managers power to alter the trust deed, they should state the fact clearly and should define to what extent it was to be allowed to be done. He had no doubt that if they had a parson who took an extreme view there would be precisely the same difficulty and trouble with the Amendment in the Bill as without it. He regretted that the Government had accepted the Amendment, which would be regarded in many quarters as a perfectly unnecessary reflection upon the parson.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) said that, before going further with this Amendment, he thought it would be a great advantage if the Government would explain what was the meaning of the word "tenor." As he understood the hon. and gallant Member, he regarded it as a security to the lay element on the management. He would assume that the trust deed said that the trust should be administered according to the doctrines of the Church of England. Then arose this question—What were the doctrines of the Church of England—what was its teaching? He did not know whether that would be the interpretation of the word "tenor." They remembered the well-known lines:—

> "Along the cool, sequestered vale of life
> They kept the noiseless tenor of their way."

He did not know whether it would be along a cool, sequestered vale they would pursue the noiseless tenor of their way when they had introduced this Amendment. There might be cases, he knew many of them, where the layman in the parish, even the majority of the subscribers, held views as to what was the teaching of the Church of England very different from those of the clergyman, who was not put into position by themselves. The hon. the Member for the University of Oxford, belonging to that annexe of the United Kingdom called England, must remember that in Scotland the laymen had some views, some control in connection with their Church. So, too, the Nonconformists of England had that control. There was only one religious community—no, two, the Church of England and the Church of Rome—where the laity had no control. It had been held that in this Bill, for the first time, there was to be given to the laity a voice in the management. The Prime Minister, time after time, had told them not to be afraid of clerical control, because the presence of three laymen among the foundation managers would be ample security against "one-man" clerical control in the school. But they must remember that the clergyman might hold a different view from the managers as to the "tenor" of the teaching. In the case of secular teaching the Board of Education was to have the power in regard to any difference of opinion that might arise there; but he did not observe that they gave any appeal in this case. Who was to decide what was to be the teaching of the Church of England? It would devolve on the representative of the Univerity of Oxford to determine what was the religious teaching of the Church of England to decide as between five laymen out of the six as against the clergyman, whether or not his teaching was in fulfilment of the trust and in accordance with the teaching of the Church of England. Therefore, he agreed with the hon. Member who had just spoken, that they must have a definition of the words of the Amendment, and that they ought to have an explanation of the word "tenor."

Mr. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tonbridge) said he was sure from the course the debate had run it must be perfectly clear that they were very much in the dark as to what the Amendment meant. Indeed, he doubted whether his hon. and gallant friend really understood it. By altering the form of his Amendment he had increased the difficulty. Originally it ran that "notwithstanding the trust deed the managers should have control." That clearly contemplated doing away with the trust deeds altogether. Now the Amendment said the teaching must be in accordance with the tenor of the provisions of the trust deed. Did he mean that the general character of the trust deed should be maintained, or did he mean that the specific conditions of the deed must be observed? He might give three specimens of the conditions referred to. First, did his hon. friend mean that the instruction should not be subject to the superintendence of the parochial clergyman? Was that the meaning of the word "tenor"? Did he contemplate that, in the event of the managers having a quarrel with the clergyman, he could be debarred from going into the school? He thought if that was so it would lead to friction in the parish which would do an immense amount of harm. The school buildings would belong not to the managers but to the trustees, and if specific conditions of the trust were broken the trustees would close the school, and the provision of a new school would be put upon the local authority. The right hon. Gentleman asked who was to control these managers in giving their religious instruction? The National Society modern trust deed provided that—

> "In case any difference should arise between the parochial clergy and the managers of the schools with reference to the preceding Rules, or any regulation connected therewith, an appeal is to be made to the Bishop of the Diocese, whose decision is final."

He did not want to argue that point because there was an appeal already to a recognised constituted authority, but if this Amendment were carried there was no appeal at all. They might give their decision in accordance with the tenor of the trust deed with no bishop or education authority to see that they did their work properly. The Government must see from this discussion that they were allowing to be introduced a very difficult and dangerous topic. He regretted altogether that this question had been raised. He had always understood that this was a Bill dealing solely with secular education and for improving the secular education given in what were now voluntary schools. Now they were asked to deal with the religious instruction given there. And why? When they were dealing with provided schools they did not touch religious education, and they left those schools subject to the Cowper-Temple Clause, the managers, and the Board of Education; but now that they had come to non-provided or voluntary schools his hon. and gallant friend moved this most obscure and difficult Amendment, putting into the hotchpotch this proposal, for which there was no demand to justify it being brought before the House at the present moment. The Government had stated from the beginning, and it had always been understood, that the six managers would control religious instruction. He supposed he had been particularly stupid, but he knew that a great many others as well never understood that, and outside this House very few other people understood it. Taking the scheme of the Bill, he wished to ask for what purpose were those two outside managers to have a voice in the religious instruction? They were to be put on as representatives of religious instruction in order to see that the school was properly conducted and to give the local education authority a voice in the appointment of teachers. It seemed to him to be a revolutionary proposal that these two outside managers should have a voice in regard to the religious instruction to be given in the schools. No doubt the Government relied upon what was called the permanent majority of the Board of Managers. He was not quite so sure that there would always be a permanent majority, because this clearly depended upon the assumption that all the foundation managers would belong to the same denomination as the school. But that was not the case at all. There were a great many Church of England schools where several of the managers were not members of the Church of England. The other day he came across a school which was working under the Charity Commission, and out of the nine members who were foundation managers no less than four were elected, two by the Vestry and two by the subscribers.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): What a shame!

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said he did not think it was a shame; on the contrary he thought it was a very good thing. Of course it did not follow when these things happened that all the foundation managers were always members of the denomination to which the school belonged, but in this particular case, out of nine five belonged to the Church of England and four did not. For the sake of illustration let them suppose that the managers remained in the proportion of nine with three added. At present five of them belonged to the Church of England and four did not, but if the local authority added three then there would be a majority of managers not belonging to the denomination, for the proportion would be altered to five belonging to the Church of England and seven who did not belong to that denomination. He simply gave that as an instance to show that the so-called permanent majority might not be a majority at all. He fully believed that the Government in accepting this Amendment were quite unaware of the difficulties it brought about, and while he recognised the very conciliatory speech of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education he appealed to the Government to reconsider the whole question, and he asked them whether in a Bill primarily for secular education it was worth while in the case of voluntary schools — and voluntary schools alone—to raise this question of religious instruction thereby bringing about a state of things which they all expected would not have taken place.

(1.8.) LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester) said he was sorry to find himself in opposition to this Amendment. He desired to oppose it strongly, and he did so on behalf of his co-religionists. This proposal was absolutely contrary to the spirit of the Bill, by which they had always understood that the religious instruction, given in the school was to be preserved and not disturbed. What he objected to was that two outside managers representing the local authority might have a voice and a vote with regard to the religious instruction given in a particular school, although they themselves did not belong to that religious communion. That appeared to him to be absolutely absurd. He could quite understand that this Amendment might be acceptable, or fairly practicable, in the minds of some members of the Church of England, because they might fairly assume that, in the majority of cases, the two representative managers appointed by the local authority would be members of the Church of England, and where that was the case the whole body of the managers would be of the same religious communion. But what about the religious minority? What about this in the case of the Catholics, the Jews, and the Wesleyans? Did the Committee suppose that the local authority was going to appoint two Catholics, two Jews, or two Wesleyans in the case of schools belonging to those denominations? Where that was done he had no objection to offer, but he did protest against inflicting on a religious minority two managers to have a voice in the religious instruction given in the school when, in his opinion, they were not competent to form an opinion upon it. It might be said that they had got their majority, and if they were satisfied with that majority as regarded the appointment of teachers why could they not be equally satisfied as regarded religious instruction? He frankly admitted that in nine cases out of ten, or in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the two representative managers of the local authority would not be so wanting in good taste as to interfere with the religious instruction of the denomination to which they did not belong, but he must remind the Committee that they were dealing with what was intended to be an Act of Parliament, and he objected strongly to giving a statutory right to a man to give his vote in a matter of religious instruction with regard to a religion to which he did not belong. He wished to remind the Committee what the Roman Catholic position was with regard to this matter. He acknowledged that they represented a minority, but he was only asking that they should be considered in the light of a minority. He claimed the indulgence of the Committee for a few moments while he considered the Catholic position. Apart from the organic constitution of the Roman Catholic Church, the teaching authority in religious matters was not the layman, and was not even the priest, but it was the bishop. Their theory was that bishops inherited the authority of the Apostles, and whatever authority was exercised by others, whether clergy or laity, was derived from the bishops. The bishops were subject to the canon law, and were more closely tied and bound by it than was generally imagined in this country. They were liable to censure, and they were liable to deprivation of their authority, if they taught or acted in defiance of the canon law of the Church. He did not ask the Committee to say whether they approved or disapproved of that system. It was an intelligible system, it was their system, and it was not going to be changed. He ventured to appeal to the Committee to ask themselves whether it was fair to foist on them in regard to religious instruction the opinions of members outside their own communion, members who not only did not belong to it, but were violently and even conscientiously opposed to it. He confessed it seemed to him to be singularly unjust. He did not know whether his hon. and gallant friend had quite considered how far the

Amendment would carry him. There was no reason why he should not be appointed by a local authority as the manager of an Anglican school or a group of Anglican schools. Yet he was a bigoted Papist! In the view of his hon. and gallant friend he was a fit and proper person to give his vote as to the religious instruction which was to be given in the Church of England schools. He did think that the acceptance of the Amendment could only lead to considerable trouble. He should not be at all surprised to find hon. Gentlemen opposite supporting this Amendment. They had avowed their determination to endeavour if possible to make this Bill, as soon as it was an Act, unworkable. This Amendment, if he understood aright the speech of the Member for West Monmouthshire, had filled the right hon. Gentleman with some alarm as to the friction which would possibly arise. The noble Lord respectfully said that in his humble judgment, if the Government accepted this Amendment they would not add to the harmonious working of their Bill. At any rate so far as he was concerned, and so far as it affected the religious community to which it was his privilege to belong, he could only repeat that if the Government forced on them the acceptance of two members not belonging to their communion to have a voice and vote in what their religious instruction was to be—he did not want to say it offensively or disrespectfully, but he said it frankly because he felt it —they would be doing an ungenerous act to a small minority in this country who represented a religious community which had shown the greatest spirit of self-sacrifice and the most earnest perseverance in striving to maintain definite religious instruction for the children of its poor.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think everybody who has heard the speech of my noble friend who has just sat down must recognise that he has spoken not only with great and genuine emotion, but also on behalf of a religious communion which is not in agreement theologically with the great majority of the people of this country, and against which there is no doubt a strong feeling prevailing among large sections of society. Therefore anything that falls from my noble friend is deserving of the earnest consideration of the Committee. But I would venture to ask my noble friend whether in what he has just said he is expressing his fear as regards any practical danger, or whether he is only giving expression to the speculative —I wish to say it not in any way disrespectfully—theology of the communion to which he belongs. In other words, does he seriously think that in the Roman Catholic schools of our great cities—for the few Catholic schools in the country districts may be ignored in this controversy—does he seriously think that in any single Roman Catholic school in any single city from the north to the south of England any difficulty would arise at any time of the kind which he fears? I draw a very wide distinction between the case which he has put with such earnestness and eloquence before the Committee, and the case which I understand is represented by two hon. friends of mine below the gangway belonging to the English Church. I do agree that with regard to what I may call the Anglican case there might conceivably be here and there and at long intervals cases of collision between the general body of managers and the clergyman of the parish, but they would be very rare. They could be counted, I think, on fewer than the fingers of one hand, but still they are possible. I will come to that case directly. I admit the possibility in that case, but as regards the Roman Catholic schools for which my noble friend pleads does he think there is the remotest possibility that there may be a collision as to which is true Catholic teaching according to the view of the Roman Catholics, or the smallest possibility of a conflict on that subject between the managers and the priest of the parish or the bishop of the diocese? I think my noble friend will probably candidly admit that, however much this may run counter to the canon law or to the established views of the religious community to which he belongs, at all events, the actual danger that an Anglican or a Baptist member of the governing body of managers shall over persuade the remaining four Roman Catholic managers to throw over their allegiance to the bishop to whom they are absolutely pledged by their religion is inappreciable. I quite sympathise with the views my noble friend has expressed, but I cannot believe that under any circumstances there is the smallest practical danger of any injury being done to the denominational teaching which he is, from his point of view, so rightly anxious to preserve. I now come to what I regard as the practical point of view—the case of the English Church, and here let me say something about the position of the Government. Two hon. friends of mine who have spoken from below the gangway have expressed great surprise that the Government has shown itself sympathetic to the Amendment of my hon. and gallant friend. It comes upon them apparently with a shock of astonishment, and they seem to think that this is sprung upon the House without the smallest preface or preparation. I have never concealed from the House generally the view I have on this matter. I am ashamed to think the number of times I have had to address the House on the subject, and all my observations on the general scheme of the Bill have been in harmony with the Amendment now before us. Not to go further, if my hon. friend will refer to *Hansard* of July 21st he will find I spoke as follows. It is reported in the third person, and I have no doubt it is quite accurate.

> "After all, secular education had something to do with national education. It was, he might remark, the main subject of the Bill, and it should not be left absolutely out of account, as being wholly alien. Religious education would be under the control, not of one man, and that man the parson of the parish, but of a Board of six. Of these, the parson would probably be the only minister of religion, and three would be managers representing the denomination." [(4) *Debates*, cxi., 867.]

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): My right hon. friend said nothing about trust deeds.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not said anything about trust deeds, but they are not very alien from the statement I have read. I was laying down what I conceived to be the general principle of the Bill, and I think everybody will admit that my speeches have always been in the same direction. My noble friend seems to think that wherever the provisions of a trust deed are in question the case is altered. But to appoint two outside managers at all is to touch the trust deed. I should like to know exactly what was meant—he is a better authority than I am—by the resolution I have seen from time to time reported in favour of obtaining rate-aid for the denominational schools and giving in exchange one-third of the management. Did that only mean subject to the unknown provisions of the trust deeds?

LORD HUGH CECIL: Certainly it meant subject to the trust deed. There has never been the slightest doubt of it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Does my noble friend mean that when a resolution of that kind was passed, it only applied to those schools in which the general tenor of the trust deed was exactly in harmony with such an arrangement?

LORD HUGH CECIL: My right hon. friend misunderstands. The general management of the school, both in secular instruction and on the borderland between secular and religious instruction, was to be under the Board of Managers. But it was never contemplated that the religious instruction should be modified in any degree.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course it was never contemplated that a Roman Catholic school should cease to be Roman Catholic.

LORD HUGH CECIL: Or that the teaching in a Roman Catholic school should be of a different kind. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: There is only one kind.]

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It was never contemplated that the teaching in a Roman Catholic school should be otherwise than Roman Catholic, or that the teaching in a Wesleyan school should be other than Wesleyan, or that the teaching in an Anglican school should be other than Anglican; but I must traverse the contention of my noble friend that it was ever contemplated that the teaching should not be under the Board of Management. Surely it would be very inconsistent if that should be so, because what had been asked for all along was that a teacher should be elected with religious qualifications for carrying on denominational teaching. That is more important than anything, and that is left, and avowedly left, to the managers as a whole. There is no question of changing the religion taught in the school. That must be in accordance with the trust deed, whether Anglican, Wesleyan or Roman Catholic, and that was perfectly consistent not only with the attitude of the Government but also with the resolutions passed by various religious bodies. I would ask one question of my hon. friends who object to this Amendment. What is it, I put it to them, that has raised almost all the difficulties in the public mind connected with religious teaching in our schools? It is the abuse, here and there, very rarely I admit, by the clergyman of the parish of the powers given him by the trust. Wherever that was done the harm that it has done to the whole cause of religious education in our public elementary schools is, in my mind, not to be measured in words. I meet it at every turn and on every occasion. The follies and indiscretions of a single individual are multiplied by public rumour till they almost stand up as a great public danger. Is it wise to leave a system in existence which can but bring the whole of our scheme of national education into discredit? It is because I desire to see this danger removed for ever from the path of religious denominational education that I am anxious to see the Amendment of my hon. and gallant friend accepted. I am convinced that, when the general public discover that we have passed a Bill which, whatever its merits or demerits, does at all events put on a solid and permanent basis a large number of the voluntary schools of the country, and that we have done nothing whatever to see that the wishes of the parents of the children have been considered, there would be a strong feeling aroused against the great reform we are suggesting. I do not pretend to maintain that, in an absolutely theoretic sense, these managers necessarily represent the parents. They are not elected by them, and, therefore, they do not represent them in that sense. But they will represent, broadly speaking, the general opinion of the particular denomination in a parish, and I think that if this Amendment is carried there really will be no danger that Anglican children will be taught a form of religion to which their parents heartily object. I have deliberately avoided dealing at the present time with the question of what is meant by the word "tenor," because I am anxious to put before the Committee some of those broader considerations which have been raised by the speeches of my hon. friends behind me.

(1.35.) LORD HUGH CECIL said that his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Education had spoken of the heated atmosphere sometimes raised when religious matters were under discussion. He should try and imitate his hon. friend and other hon. Members in the quiet tone and spirit of goodwill they had adopted. But he was afraid that, while they might discuss this matter as calmly as possible and recognise the excellent intentions that animated his hon. and gallant friend and the Government, outside the House the Amendment would excite a feeling of bitterness and pain which it was very difficult for hon. Members to appreciate. There were many good persons who had been doing their work in the schools from the best motives for twenty and more years past who would feel that in this Amendment a most unjust slur and indignity was cast upon them. The justification advanced for the Amendment was what was truly called the unwise and improper use of their position by certain, a very small number, of the clergy, but he could not believe that it passed the wit of Parliament, supposing they were to deal with this question at all, to devise a remedy for the incumbents of, say, 20 parishes, which would not upset and annoy and insult the incumbents of 11,000 parishes. He could not help tracing here some of the military predilection for general punishments of which they heard a good deal last summer. It was the government of the Church not by Rome, or Geneva, or Canterbury, but by Sandhurst. The elementary schools, unlike the older educational institutions, lacked the possession of that very useful officer, a visitor. His hon. friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education would be perfectly familiar with the functions of a visitor. He should like to hear what would be said, if a visitor of an Oxford College who discovered that one of the fellows had developed Popish proclivities, came down on the whole university and abused the governing bodies on account of the wrong-doing of a single colleague. He thought it would be fairly possible, in the case of their elementary schools, to have some system of visitation in regard to religious instruction which would be a very much better and less offensive remedy than the one proposed in the Amendment. How did the Amendment stand in relation to the great principles which the Government had over and over again laid down as the foundation principles of this measure? They had been told over and over again that there must be regard for the proprietary rights of those who had built and were supporting the buildings, and it had been laid down as an absolutely essential condition that the denominational character of the schools as settled under the trust deeds should be respected. But what business had they to pick and choose in an obligation of that kind? What right had they to say that this part of the trust deed was sacred and inviolable, and that part might be set aside altogether? It was perfectly true that in respect of secular education the trusts had been greatly, and very reasonably, modified, but religious instruction had all along been put outside the scheme of the control of the local education authority. The hon. Member for Flint Boroughs had an Amendment which proposed to go a little further than the Government had gone. The position of that hon. Member seemed to be, " The Government have destroyed the trust rights in certain respects, why should I not go a little further and destroy some other trust rights?" What conceivable answer could the Government make to that argument? He could see no answer. His hon. and gallant friend spoke a great deal about "clerical control." He did not think there was an hon. Member who had a greater dislike for priestcraft and clerical control than he had. No one who more clearly recognised than he did the destructive element in the national life of anything that resembled the intrusion of the clergy in the life of the home, of the State, and of local organization outside their proper sphere and function. But there was no priestcraft in a clergyman giving instruction in religion. That was his function, just as much as it was the function of an officer to fight or of a barrister to argue. That was what he was there for, and, if he did not do that, why should they have clergy at all? He noticed in the proceedings of the great Nonconformist bodies it was recognised that the ministry had a special function in regard to religious instruction, and there could be no doubt whatever that the giving of religious instruction had become a duty of clergymen of the Church of England. In the general discussion, in which the laity took part, the teacher was condemned, but the final decision was left to what he believed was known as the Pastoral Assembly. Therefore, even in the Wesleyan body, it was recognised that the ministry had a special function in respect of religious instruction; and there could be no doubt whatever that the giving of religious instruction was one of the duties of clergymen of the Church of England. Were they going to say to these clergymen: "This is your peculiar position: you have given up your lives to this work, you have had to work very hard on a very slight income, and you have done a great deal of praiseworthy work, in order that you may be a religious minister, and, among other functions, a religious instructor; but you must now take your instructions from a body of laymen who will not claim that they have any special knowledge of religious instruction?" Let the Committee consider who the managers in a rural parish would be likely to be. They would probably be the squire, but he would very seldom attend, because he would have other things, very often, to do. There would be also, perhaps, a retired naval or military officer, living on independent means, and doing a lot of very useful work. Then there would be a representative of the County Council, probably the local County Councillor; and there would be a village tradesman, who would be a prominent member of the Church, perhaps a churchwarden, and a tradesman or farmer representing the Parish Council. Under his hon. and gallant friend's singular theological system, they would be the infallible interpreters of religious truth, but of course these five gentlemen would not be likely to claim any such function as that of criticising and determining religious instruction in the schools. His hon. and gallant friend knew as well as he did that in 999 cases out of 1,000 they would not dream of interfering. He would like to ask his hon. and gallant friend how he or any other hon. Member would like it if, in his particular profession, he was suddenly to be told that the profession, as a class, could not be trusted; and that therefore they would be placed under the orders of quite incompetent persons. What would his hon. and gallant friend say if some military matter with which he was connected was submitted to the Parish Council or County Council? Of course, his hon. and gallant friend would say that, whether such powers were exercised or not, it was treating him very hardly to put him in such a position. In the great majority of cases the majority of the managers would be reasonable people, and would support their reasonable clergyman, but it did not at all follow that there might not be, on many Boards, one cantankerous member; and anyone who knew anything of human nature, especially human nature which took an interest in ecclesiastical matters, would appreciate the difficulties that might arise. He would give the Committee an actual instance. In a parish with which he was acquainted, there was, up to a recent period, a lady who was doing most excellent work, who was munificent and pious, and devoted, among other good works, to the cause of education. She built, out of her own money, a school, and wished to be the absolute controller of it. Her views were of the moderate Evangelical kind, but, owing to peculiarities of temperament, that did not prevent her being a difficult person to get on with. The clergyman of the parish was not in the least degree ritualistic, but, nevertheless, there was, despite most laborious efforts on the part of the clergy, constant friction, because the lady had a feeling which many people would share—she disliked curates. She had great respect for the rector of the parish, who lived two miles from her school, and that added to the mechanical difficulties of the situation. She would not allow the curates inside the school, and the rector had to cycle at a very early hour in the morning to the school to be present at the religious lesson. The friction that arose in the parish might seem incredible to those not familiar with rural life. At one awful period the action of a hot-tempered curate divided the children of the school into two camps, and collisions arose between them. This, however, was got over by the interposition of a curate gifted with great power of irrelevant smiling, and the tension subsided, though it was only at the very end of this lady's life that she regretted having given so much trouble in connection with the school. That was the kind of case which often occurred in rural life, and that was the kind of person who would be on the board of management, because of the interest displayed by her in educational work. But let the Committee conceive what a lot of trouble one cantankerous individual like that would give at every meeting of the board of management. However sympathetic the majority of the managers might be towards the clergyman, there would be endless friction and disturbance for no purpose whatever. Therefore, he was opposed to the Amendment altogether, but, perhaps, a compromise might be arrived at by the adoption of the Amendment of which he had given notice—the insertion after "and" of the words "subject to those provisions." It would then be clear that the clergyman's rights under the trust were not superseded. The trust deeds of the National Society provided that the clergyman should have control and management of the instruction given in the Sunday school, and superintendence of the religious instruction given in the day school. The words were—

> "Provided always that the superintendence of the religious instruction to be given in the said school, and the entire control and management of any Sunday school, shall be vested in the said minister, for the time being, and in case of any dispute or difference arising on any matter affecting the religious instruction in the said school, an appeal may be made to the Bishop of the diocese, whose decision shall be final, conclusive, and binding on all parties."

He thought that that would really meet the difficulty which his hon. and gallant friend felt; but what he wished to call the attention of the Committee to was that while the minister was to have the superintendence of the religious instruction in the day school, he was to have the entire control and management of the religious instruction in the Sunday school. He apprehended that "superintendence" meant that the clergyman might go into the day school and see what kind of teaching was being given, but that the control of the religious instruction would not be in his hands. He could not say, for instance, on what day, and at what services the children should be present. It would be a great mistake to suppose that the laity were not sometimes extreme ritualists. The Committee might contemplate the character of Lord Halifax to realise what a mistake that was. They were often more unreasonable and difficult to deal with than the clergy. In respect to the recent decision upon the use of incense, in many instances the willingness of clergymen to acquiesce was strongly opposed by leading members of their congregations, so that the Amendment of his hon. and gallant friend would not meet the difficulty; it would punish both the innocent and the guilty, and not all the guilty. The Amendment was really not suited to the object in view, for which the form of visitation he had mentioned was better adapted. Suppose a clergyman excluded from giving religious instruction in the school, in what condition would be the teaching of religion in the parish? The clergyman would not be excluded from control of the Sunday school, and he would teach in the parish church, and how would it be with the children if the teaching they received in the day school was at variance with the teaching they received in the Sunday school and in church? If the children were to be kept out of the way of the doctrine, they must never be allowed to go to Sunday school or church. He would rather leave the Bill as it stood. Nothing could be more grotesque than that two different systems should be taught in the name of one religious denomination. It would be a thousand times better to have no Church school than a Church school in open contradiction with the Church that would lead to nothing but friction and ill feeling. If the Amendment were carried, he believed the clergy would feel it to be a great wrong, that they had in an Act of Parliament been censured as a body in a most solemn way, that their faces had been, as it were, slapped, while the great majority of them, in his opinion, had not done anything to deserve such an insult. They in that House had not deserved to be put in the awkward and disagreeable position of being agents of that insult. (2.5.)

(2.30.) COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) thanked the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich for having tactfully accepted a hint that an Irish illustration might be provocative of contention, and for having instead introduced the Committee to that delightful English parish in which raged no storms greater than those that could be occasioned by the colour of a stole, and which could be allayed by the smiles of a curate. In the main, the noble Lord was right in objecting to the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Member for Newport. The Prime Minister had indeed said that the opposition of the noble Lord the Member for Chichester was based exclusively on speculative theology, but it could be easily shown that at least Roman Catholics had more solid reasons than speculation for their resistance to the Amendment. If he himself (Colonel Nolan) were appointed to decide what religious doctrines should be taught in a score of Protestant schools in England, this would only produce a stupid and incongruous situation—as a Catholic kept in bounds by public opinion could do no real mischief in England; but if he were appointed to control the religious education of a dozen Protestant schools in Ireland, the situation would be considered intolerable to Protestants. Now this is exactly the case in England, the names being reversed. The Catholics, however, were in a hopeless minority in Great Britain, and this Amendment gave power to the members of a Protestant majority to decide which doctrine should be taught in the schools of the minority. It is argued that the Amendment leaves a majority to the denominational managers of the school; it is true that at present the majority of managers will materially be in harmony with the religion of the school, but often the foundation managers may be sick, absent, or perhaps one of them sulky, and then the holders of an opposing faith are to control the doctrine of the school. Fears may be legitimately entertained that if trusts were confiscated and their intention reversed under this Amendment, then for the future Catholic donors would not leave legacies for the specific purposes of education, but would be driven to bequeath their money absolutely to bishops. Owing to some relics of the penal laws, this had already often taken place in Ireland. But a greater danger existed from the Amendment. At present the denominational managers of the denominational schools were to be in a majority, the elected managers in a minority. But what was to prevent a future Liberal Government from reversing the position? Then the situation of the denominational schools would be this. A Conservative Government would have torn up their trust deeds by adopting the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Member for Newport, while the future Liberal Government might, by the simple process of increasing the elected members, hand over the whole religious teaching to a hostile religious majority. What could the denominational schools do then? Nothing, but throw up the Government grants—perhaps even losing the resources bequeathed by pious founders—and begin all over again. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich had placed an Amendment on the Paper, the adoption of which would certainly mitigate the evil consequences to be feared from the original Amendment. Still it would not be a perfect remedy, and he hoped that the House would consider the hard case of the Roman Catholics, whose only hope of safety lay in the honest administration of the law, and who were unwilling to substitute for this in their schools the direction of men of another faith upon such a vital question as religious training.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) thought that in reference to this Amendment they required a little more information, both as to its drafting and substance. In neither of the speeches delivered from the Treasury Bench had they been able to understand how far the wording of this Amendment carried out the purpose which the First Lord of the Treasury and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education desired. The Parliamentary Secretary's speech laid down that this Amendment was merely carrying out what was intended by the Government, but the speech of the Prime Minister carried it further by saying that it was always the intention of the Government in this Bill to give to the managers absolute control over the religious teaching of the schools. He wished at once to lay down an absolute protest against the theory that it was understood throughout the country by Churchmen that by this Bill they handed over the denominational teaching in the school to a majority of those who might not really understand the particular doctrines of the owners of the school. That was not understood. They understood that they handed over the secular instruction, and many other functions which formerly belonged to the denomination, but they certainly did not understand that it included the definition of dogmatic teaching in the religious instruction of the school. They had not had any clear explanation upon that point at present. The speech of the hon. and gallant Gentleman who moved the Amendment was, it seemed to him, not quite in agreement with the speeches which they had had from the Front Bench. It was much more of a Church discipline speech than one in connection with education, and he confessed that he did not think this was the most favourable opportunity for dealing with Church discipline. If there were clergymen in the Church of England teaching such doctrines to the children as were not fit to be taught in the school, he thought they were no more fit to teach those doctrines, either from the pulpit or in the Sunday school. The remedy now proposed was one which could only bring friction in its course, because, as the noble Lord had pointed out, it meant that in such parishes they would have a dual teaching, under which one authority would conduct the teaching in the day school, and another in the church and Sunday school. Looking at this question from the hon. and gallant Member's point of view, he feared that the result of this Amendment, if passed as drafted, would not be in the sense which he desired. As soon as it was understood by reading the hon. and gallant Member's speech, and by reading the debate in the House which had taken place this afternoon, that the managers in the future were to practically have discretion over the trust deeds, to choose the little bits they liked out of them, and leave out the bits they did not like, the result would not be as the mover of the Amendment wished, but rather in an opposite direction, because the trustees would then be bound in every selection they made for the foundation managers to put on what they considered to be a sound man. There would be no give and take, and no carrying out of the natural promptings to put on the most representative people in the parish, but there would be a tendency to put on extremists. Therefore, he was afraid that this Amendment would have the opposite effect to that which was desired, and from that point of view he approached this subject. There had, of course, been one thing made clear by the speech which they had listened to from the noble Lord below him a little earlier in the afternoon, and it was to the effect that it was almost impossible to apply this Amendment to certain sections of the denominational schools. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education said he thought this would work, because in England, as a rule, they took theology as they found it. He wished to point out that in the Roman Catholic schools they did not take theology as they found it, for they considered it was a very serious matter and a very dogmatic one, and if the Parliamentary Secretary's argument was followed out, he must allow that the Roman Catholic schools must be excluded from the scope of this Amendment. He did not think it was quite desirable, from the point of view of those who accepted this Bill as an acknowledgment of the importance of denominational teaching in connection with their primary schools, that they should let it go forth from the spokesman of the Board of Education that they could leave theology to take its own line, and leave it to any body of persons they might appoint to hold office.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he did not say that. What he said was that the Government were especially anxious to preserve the tenour and the character of denominational teaching as prescribed in the trust deed, but that the average Englishman did not concern himself so much with theology except where clergymen insisted upon observances not in accordance with the general desires of the community, and therefore would not be likely to interfere with the ordinary course of religious teaching in the school.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY said they had to oppose that particular danger, and the mere fact that from the Government spokesmen they had had the acknowledgment that the managers were to follow what they said was the tenour, but which was not to be the full provisions of the trust deeds, was to hand over the power to those managers, which was never contemplated by the supporters of this Bill. At all events, they ought to receive further information with regard to the word "tenor". He was anxious to know what the meaning of the word tenor was, and he had consulted a dictionary which defined the meaning of the word as "purport, general course or drift." If those were the meanings he did not know that the addition of this word had any advantage, and it was far better to leave those words out and trust to the provisions of the trust deeds. He hoped that might be the ultimate decision they would arrive at. From some remarks made by the First Lord of the Treasury in reply to other speeches, he rather gathered that his opinion was that the employment of the teacher was more necessary in reference to religious instruction than the presence of the clergyman. That was entirely contrary to their contention. They had always contended that one of the first duties of the clergyman was in the school to teach the children the religious instruction in connection with the denomination to which he belonged, and the chief responsibility for this rested upon the clergyman. He confessed that he had always understood that the right and privilege of the parents was in the Conscience Clause and not in the dictation of a particular dogmatic teaching which the children should receive. The parents knew the particular religious teaching by the fact that they sent their children to the school of that particular denomination. They had the right to withdraw their children under the Conscience Clause, and therefore he did not think that the parents were the proper people to decide this matter, which should be left to those who founded the school under the provisions of the trust deed. There was one class of schools which had not been mentioned, namely, those who had no trust deeds at all. There were a great many schools in this country at the present moment which did not possess any trust deeds. A great number of the schools spoken of as Church schools were in the hands of private owners, and some did not possess trust deeds, but which for centuries had been closely connected with the Church. Such schools were not bound by any particular provision except by some old connection of the Church of England. He did not think that this Clause met their case at all, because if they left out of the central portion of the Clause the words "in accordance with the tenor of the provisions (if any) of the trust deed relating thereto" it did not apply to them. If those words were left out the Amendment would read—

> "Religious instruction shall be given in a school not provided by the local education authority and shall be under the control of the managers."

Therefore, in that case, the managers would have sole control and could dictate in religion. That was the strict meaning of the words, although the Government did not intend it to be so. The debate had shown, he thought, that the Amendment was not free from great ambiguity, and that the mover of it and the Government seemed to have approached the matter from an entirely different point of view. The debate also had shown that under this Amendment some denominations must clearly be exempted. This Amendment had raised an extremely thorny subject, and he urged the Government to consider very carefully whether they could not find either some Amendment of this provision or some other means of satisfying the minds of many loyal supporters who would like to support the Bill, but who felt that this proposal went further than they anticipated.

(3.0.) SIR JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said this Bill was intended to redress well-founded grievances, which they had endured for many years. He regretted that he could not accept the reply given by the Prime Minister as sufficient. He associated himself with his right hon. friend and others in the recognition of the great need to guard against exceptional religious observances and peculiar teachings being imported into the schools which were not in accordance with the principles of the Church or in harmony with the wishes of the majority of the people. He thought it was calculated to create difficulty and permanent trouble in the denominational schools. Apart from the Roman Catholic community he should think that others, as, for instance, the Jewish persuasion, might well object to the intrusion of managers, who need not either share or sympathise with the opinions of the foundation managers. The Amendment was illogical and contrary to sound principle. It proposed that the religious instruction given in the schools should be under the control of the managers. The great function of the parish clergyman was to supervise religious instruction in the parish, and his first duty was to instruct both old and young in religion and in the things necessary to their salvation. If the managers were to control the religious instruction given in the school they might as reasonably control the religious instruction given from the pulpit. One of the great disadvantages in this country was that the people were not uniformly instructed in religious principles. How was it that people were falling away from the Protestant Churches? They did not hear of Roman Catholics being converted to other persuasions, and that was because they were instructed in the principles of their Church from their youth upwards. He held that the falling away from the Protestant Churches was because the people had not been sufficiently instructed in early youth. That instruction could be best given by persons skilled in teaching and from whom the children were accustomed to receive instruction. He did not know whether the Government, who had readily accepted the Amendment, were disposed to make any modification in its terms. He reminded the Government that the constitution of the board of managers had been vitally changed since the Clause was introduced, and contended that the modifications which had been made involved an infraction of the principle of the Bill as originally drafted in so far as the composition of the board of managers was concerned. He regretted that the Amendment had been obtruded on the Committee at this stage. It was unnecessary, and calculated to serve sectarian prejudices and to disturb harmonious relations. He should certainly vote against the Amendment as it stood if there should be a division, but he did hope that the Government would consider the objections that had been raised by some of their best supporters and would not insist on forcing into the Bill that which would give offence to many of the very best friends of religious education, and that which would do harm in the future.

Mr. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) said he wished to support the view put forward by his hon. and gallant friend the Member for North Galway. He knew the position of the Irish Catholics of England and Wales in this matter. Most of those who came over to England and Wales originally were the very poorest of their race. He would oppose the Amendment because it would inflict serious injury and wrong on those people. At present they paid rates for board schools out of their slender and scanty resources. He thought it was very unfair to Catholics, who had made sacrifices and built schools for the teaching of their own religion, out of their slender and scanty resources, that under the cover of this insidious Amendment they should be obliged to run the risk of having their schools confiscated. The Prime Minister had said that it did not matter although two men opposed to their faith were imported into the management of Catholic schools. This was a very serious matter for Roman Catholics. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, who took a sympathetic view of this matter, had shown his appreciation of their position when he spoke of different kinds of Roman Catholicism. There was only one kind. That was the kind which had lasted from the beginning, and would last to the end. They did not want, in connection with Catholic schools, men imported into the management who differed from them in religious affairs. They had to look to the future. At present they had a Government who had been to a certain extent sympathetic with the Catholics in this matter. The Prime Minister had stated that in England there was a tendency to magnify small abuses, and it was possible that in the future a "No Popery" or anti-ritualist storm might sweep over the country, and there might be a Government in power hostile to the Roman Catholics. If the hon. Member for Carnarvon was in power, and if there was a Government led by him—he was fit to lead a Government—if the Government was inspired by his views, the composition of the Board of Managers might be altered. Instead of having two managers not holding Roman Catholic opinions there might be a majority hostile to that religion. In the part of Ireland where he lived there were only about two per cent. of Presbyterians, and if the rule were applied there which it was proposed to apply here it would mean that the Roman Catholics would be in a position to confiscate a school which a Presbyterian gentleman had provided at a cost of £800 for the children belonging to his creed. He would explain his own personal position in this matter. The hon. Member for North Galway had pointed out that in every part of England Roman Catholics were in a minority except in the Scotland Division of Liverpool. [An Hon. Member: "Where is the Member?"] That was the very question he was going to ask. He had been torn by two conflicting passions. He had been unjustly punished by the Government, but the hon. Member for the Scotland Division had taken very good care never to have upon him the weighty hand of England in Ireland. He could not vote on this Amendment with the Government. It was not in human nature to do so, and he supposed there was some human nature in Irishmen. He could not go into the same lobby with men who had recently sent him to prison. At the same time he felt a conflict of opinion on this matter because of the devotion he had to the old Church of his fathers. But there was no excuse for the hon. Member for the Scotland Division not being here to stand up for the Catholics of Liverpool who put him into this Parliament. They were told by the gentleman who regulated the wild-cat politics in Ireland that it was on account of coercion they should abandon the interests of Irish Catholic children of England and Wales. He asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland yesterday how many were in the prison list on April 5th in Connaught and in the adjoining counties of Longford and West Meath——

*THE CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing the Crimes Act at present.

MR. TULLY: Mr. Lowther, I am deeply obliged to you, Sir. The hon. Member said he was merely striving to explain his personal position. He hoped he would be allowed to put his point as a matter of personal explanation. He asked the Chief Secretary how many were in the prison list in April and how many this day week. The right hon. Gentleman's answer was that there were five in April, and he was one of them, while this day week there was not one. The gentlemen who left the Irish Benches and would not vote on this Amendment which affected the Catholics of England were the same gentlemen who were voting for this Bill in April when he was one of the five in prison. So that there was no justification for their desertion of these Benches on the ground of coercion. Another reason why they should be here to support the Amendment was that they had received valuable support from the Irish Catholics. He read in the newspapers the other day that out of £11,000 subscribed for the Irish Parliamentary fund £4,800 came from the Catholics of England and Wales. On that ground these gentlemen should have been here. He intended to vote against the Government on this Amendment, because he believed it would do a grievous wrong to the Irish Catholics in England and Wales. If the Amendment were incorporated in the Bill it would be the thin end of the wedge by which Roman Catholics sooner or later might have their schools confiscated.

(3.23.) MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) was very glad that the Government had accepted this Amendment, because after the sympathetic attitude which they had taken up towards the agricultural interest he would have found it very hard to vote against them. The Government had given them £900,000, and he hoped they would show that they were not ungrateful. Last night the Prime Minister said he did not know where on earth he could find gratitude. He could inform his right hon. friend that he would find it in the bosoms of the members of the agricultural party—so long as he treated them fairly. Personally, he did not consider that any of the Amendments which had been moved were of the slightest importance, and the bulk of his constituents did not care a brass farthing for them. But this particular Amendment was certainly worth supporting, because it would remove causes of friction, and it would have a salubrious effect in certain parishes with which he was acquainted. It would also form a very agreeable corrective to the incessant beating of the ecclesiastical drum by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, and other hon. Members below the gangway.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton) said he could not agree with his hon. and gallant friend that the passing of this Amendment in its present form would tend to smooth the passage of the Bill. He thought it was regarded on this side of the House with very great alarm. But however that might be, he was sure they were all agreed that the Government had devoted their best energies towards securing denominational education, on behalf of which great sacrifices had been made in the past, and in the interest of which Churchmen generally were prepared to put up with certain restrictions. With regard to the controversy over the selection of teachers, they were very grateful on this side of the House for the firmness with which the Government had stood to their guns The public wanted to know what were to be the powers conferred by the Bill on the managers, and also how far their position as trustees would be affected by the new system. He thought they had not sufficiently considered the position of the clergy in this matter, and that they often forgot the great services which that body of men had rendered to education in the past. There ought to be also some gratitude for favours to come, because it must be remembered that they wanted the clergy to take a great part in carrying out this Bill when it was passed. That was to be of vital importance. His fear was that if the Amendment were carried in its present form, and that the clergy were only told that religious instruction was to be carried on "according to the tenor of the trust deeds," and if it were intimated to them that they were absolutely under the control of the board of managers, they would feel when they went on to the new board of management, that they had a rope round their necks which would hinder their exertions. Some hon. Members were only just beginning to understand that the trust deeds were to be interfered with. When they came to interfere with the action of religious teaching it was a very serious thing indeed, and he would very cordially agree with the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich in asking the Government to let the trust deeds stand on the basis to which he alluded when he said that the managers should be given the superintendence of religious education in the day schools, as differentiated from the control otherwise. If that were done and the managers had control—which should be specified in the clearest way—according to the conditions of the trust deed, it seemed to him that they would be able to use their power and influence, and to make their control effective. Even if the clergyman, as Chairman, were allowed the superintendence of religious instruction, the managers would be able to forbid the introduction of objectionable pictures and handbooks, and services which were not in accordance with the doctrines and practices of the Church of England. That would be a control with which the country would be satisfied.

MR. GOULDING (Wiltshire, Devizes) said that, speaking in behalf of those who were in favour of denominational schools, they had never contemplated before that afternoon that the representatives of the local authority on the Board of Managers would have any say whatever in the denominational instruction given to the pupils. ["Hear, hear!" and ironical cheers from the OPPOSITION Benches.] He certainly differed entirely from the hon. Gentleman opposite, because he believed in denominational teaching. He understood that a bargain had been entered into: that the schools were to be placed under popular control in regard to secular education, but that the managers were to have power to give religious instruction according to the faith of the parents in the denominational schools. If this Amendment were carried, the result of giving this mandatory instruction to the managers to take an active part in deciding what kind of faith was to be taught in the schools, what could any reasonable man contemplate except friction and confusion? He had given a strong pledge to his constituents that he would do the best he could to support the maintenance of denominational schools in the country, and he therefore could take no part whatever in voting for the Amendment. He most respectfully said that it was a mockery to ask men who were not Churchmen or Roman Catholics to come and sit at a Board and lay down laws as to the tenets that were to be held, and the instruction that was to be given, in these schools. He appealed to the Prime Minister—because he was perfectly certain that some of his supporters in the country were believers in denominational education, and wished this Bill to be passed into law—that he ought to be very chary before he inflicted upon them the hardship and the slur which the clergy would feel if this Amendment were passed. He appealed most earnestly to the Prime Minister not to put too strong a pressure upon his supporters on that side of the House to vote for his Amendment, and to postpone the discussion of this question until the eighty representatives of Ireland, who were now absent from the House, and who represented the great Roman Catholic body, could be present.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said that he was sorry he could not agree with his hon. friend that they should delay this question to a later date. He had no desire to prolong the debate, but he would put this question to his hon. friend who had spoken so strongly in regard to the Amendment: "If his view is correct, and if the managers are to have no voice in regard to religious instruction to be given in denominational schools, what are we fighting for?" He understood that they were to have a denominational majority on the managing body and that thereby they would secure the religious instruction which was to be given. But if the managers were only to have power over secular instruction, then he agreed with his hon. friend that Clause 7 ought to be re-cast. Surely it was not to be said that the clergy were to have complete superintendence of the voluntary schools. He believed they would still have a very strong and influential voice, especially in regard to religious education. That was what he wanted; but he believed that the trustees would retain great power of control over the schools.

MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said that to his mind they were dealing now with one of the most anxious and intricate matters which had been brought before the Committee. It could not be denied that this question of religious education had roused a strong feeling on the part of hon. Gentlemen opposite. He regretted that the Amendment had been brought forward, and that the Government had been induced to give its sanction to it. There were two reasons why he was opposed to the Amendment. In the first instance he could not think there was any worse way of dealing with the point under discussion. If it was true that there were extreme ritualistic practices in certain cases, then these ought to be put down by proper disciplinary measures. In the second place, he considered that the Amendment would introduce friction and trouble into the National Church. Clergymen who introduced these illegal practices ought to be deposed at once, but the assumption was that they were kept within the parish and yet that the managers of the schools were prohibited from superintending the religious teaching. Could human ingenuity provide the machinery which would be more fertile in introducing religious difficulties? If the parishioners and the clergyman were not at one, the clergyman ought to be deposed by legal action and through the action of the bishop. To keep the clergyman in the parish under a prohibition from teaching would be to put him into perpetual antagonism to the religious teaching, not only of the teachers of the children but to the whole life of the parish. He thought that the Amendment was absolutely futile, and that it had been brought in from religious animosity.

(3.52.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I would ask the Committee, I will not say to come to a decision now on the whole Amendment, but, at all events, if they consider this Amendment to be a proper subject to work upon to enter upon the task of amending the Amendment if necessary. That would bring the debate on the general question, so far as those Amendments raise it, to an end. I think we ought, if possible, to bring it to an end, though I have not the least desire to minimise its difficulty or importance. I would point out that the debate has been going on four hours, and I do not want to add to its length. I think if my advice is taken, and we do enter on the Amendments, the Committee will perhaps expect me to say a word or two before we reach that stage. My hon. and learned friend who has just spoken does not like this method of preventing abnormal or eccentric teaching in Church schools, and thinks that that should be dealt with by proper disciplinary measures affecting the whole of our ecclesiastical organisation. That might be a very good solution; but I ask whether it is a practicable solution? If a modest Amendment of this kind raises this immense mass of religious difficulty, of religious feeling, I ask whether any Gentleman bringing in a great measure of disciplinary reform of the Church of England would be likely to have a very agreeable time before him? Evidently, if anything is to be done, and to be done soon, it must be done irrespective of any such widespreading measure. I wholly agree with my hon. and learned friend and other speakers on this side of the House in desiring to see the trust deeds interfered with as little as possible. With that broad principle I entirely agree, but we must all recognise that this Bill does involve some interference with trust deeds, that some interference is inevitable, and all we can do is to cut down that interference to the narrowest proportions consistent with the general principles that underlie the measure. My noble friend the Member for Greenwich has upon the Paper an Amendment, which, as I understand, would preserve the control of the managers, but would, as regards any other power, leave them subject to the trust deed. If such an Amendment can be devised I have no objection to it. What I do object to is anything that interferes with the control of the managers. That is the essence of the Amendment. I do not think it is worth while persevering with anything short of that. On the other hand, to go an inch further, I think, is unnecessary and would be extremely undesirable. So much for the general principle. Then I am told, and I am afraid I am told with a certain amount of truth, that the Amendment of my gallant friend cannot be otherwise than distasteful to a great many most admirable clergymen who have devoted their time to educational work in their parishes, who have never come into the smallest conflict with members either of their own community or of other communities, and who will feel themselves insulted by any provision of the kind which my gallant friend suggests. I do not think that they ought to have this feeling. I am the last man in the House—and I think the Committee will agree that I have done something to prove it—who would desire to run counter in any way to the legitimate feelings of any body of clergymen, especially, least of all, of those of the Church of England. But I am afraid that some of the speeches delivered this afternoon, though temperate and moderate in tone, may produce irritation which, apart from these speeches, I should have expected would have remained quiescent. When a large number of Members say that they are deeply concerned for the welfare of the Church and the honour of the clergy, and that not only would the clergy have their feelings hurt, but that they ought to be hurt, I am afraid that the deplorable evil that may result from these remarks cannot but be aggravated in consequence. But we have to consider other persons besides the clergy. The clergy have done the lion's share in the educational work of the country, and in my opinion they have not received sufficient gratitude. But we mean to call into existence, if we can, other managers who, if they do not rival the clergy, will, at all events, bear their fair share in the work of education. What is to be their feeling if the Amendment of my hon. and gallant friend is rejected? Remember we have taken away from these managers all control of secular education. Their powers as regards secular education will be simply what the education authority choose to make them. All the great questions of policy connected with the school will not be decided by them, but by the education authority. It is now proposed to take away from them—[Lord Hugh Cecil: Not to give them.] Yes, not to give them, in the Bill which calls them into existence, even the smallest share in the control of the religious education of the schools in any of the schools where the existing trust deeds give it to the clergyman. What will the five managers have to do in the interval between the selection of teachers? They will be called in, no doubt, when a teacher is to be selected, but that will be a comparatively rare occurrence, and in the interval they will have no administrative work at all to carry out. How can a system like that evoke that interest in the management of the school which we all desire to see? I have listened with a little surprise to the expression of general feeling which has come from so many quarters on this side of the House. I have been in the forefront of the battle over this Bill ever since it was introduced. I have not always received enthusiastic support, I quite admit, even from some of those who have been, on general policy, in harmony with the policy of the Government. There was a time when they looked very coldly upon the Bill. What was the tenor of their expressions? Their cry was that this was a Bill to give clerical control—a cry caught up by many supporters of the Government from the loud utterances of many Gentlemen on the other side of the House. I will not attempt to estimate the number of letters I have received from friends of the Government, stating that this was a dreadful measure, that in the guise of improving secular education, the Government were really fastening upon their necks the yoke of the clergy. We all know what was the source of those letters. They were faithfully distributed by too apt disciples among those who should have looked with some suspicion upon the source from which these calumnious utterances arose. Now I find a strange change has come over the aspect of the question. The Bill is now beginning to be understood, and as it is beginning to be understood it is becoming more popular, and as it becomes more popular this extraordinary phenomenon has taken place — that those who were uttering these melancholy prophecies as to the way in which the Bill would fasten clerical control on us and our children now are rising in their thousands, saying that the Bill is an insult to the clergy. Every man has a right to his own opinions and to give expression to them. I only say, with all respect, that it is not very easy to conduct a highly controversial Bill in the midst of a storm of criticism, and to find that among those on whose support we have a right to count are those who have changed their tactics at different stages in the course of the controversy. I quite recognise that there is a strong feeling in the House, and in quarters of the House where I count on most strenuous support of the principle of the Bill, in favour of this Amendment. I shall not make it a Government matter. I shall most emphatically vote for it myself, and I trust that all those who agree with me in the general principles of the Bill will support me in the division.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said he had taken the greatest possible interest in the very frank avowal of his right hon. friend, which was so much cheered on the other side. Still, he was a little in the dark; and he was afraid if his right hon. friend persisted in the attitude he had taken up, he would find that the Amendment would be carried, and if carried it would certainly be fatal to the Bill, because it would render disaffected all those on whose support the Government could count. When he first looked at the Amendment, he regarded it as a kind of military incursion into the ecclesiastical domain. Now, he believed it was really and distinctly a Government Amendment; and he very much doubted whether the hon. and gallant sponsor of the Amendment was its real author. It was a Government Amendment to conciliate the Opposition, and he thought it would succeed to this extent. What would happen when they went to a division was that the Opposition would vote for the Amendment, and that the true friends of the denominationalists would vote against it. That was a very awkward situation. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich was his superior officer on the occasion, and he could not, therefore, discharge his allegiance to the Government, but would follow the noble Lord into the division lobby against an Amendment which would have a very evil effect on the Bill.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN moved to insert in the Amendment, before the word "school," the words, "public elementary." The object, he said, was to limit the scope of the Amendment to day schools.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 1, after 'a,' to insert 'public elementary.'"—(*Mr. Griffith Boscawen.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment," put and agreed to.

LORD HUGH CECIL said he did not intend, after the long discussion, to move to omit the words, "the tenour of," but he should move to insert after "and" in the original Amendment the words, "subject to those provisions." He did not know what the precise effect of the words would be, but he thought they would allow the clergyman to visit the school, see what was going on, and hear the Catechism being taught. The object of his Amendment was to secure that the control of the managers should be subject to the terms of the trust deed. Unless this Amendment was carried, the evils which his right hon. friend thought might arise out of the discussion would be found to be very real indeed. He hoped very earnestly that the Government would accept this Amendment. It was the only course open by which they could still the storm which had been so unfortunately raised. The managers had the right to appoint and dismiss the teachers, and therefore their control was complete already. If the words he suggested were accepted, the Amendment would combine the two streams of feeling, though neither would be completely satisfied, and the sense of personal wrong on the part of the clergy would be removed.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 3, after 'and,' to insert 'subject to those provisions.'"—(*Lord Hugh Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he understood that the object of his noble friend was to leave to the control of the managers everything that was not controlled by the trust deed.

LORD HUGH CECIL said he did not know what his right hon. friend meant by "control."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said no stronger word had occurred to himself or to those who advised him in the matter. It had been used throughout the Bill as the strongest word to indicate power over any course of instruction. He did not think the words proposed by his noble friend would do, but the general principle he had laid down would be safeguarded if they put in the following proviso:—

> "Provided that any power as to religious instruction conferred by the deed on any clergyman or minister of religion shall, subject to such control, remain vested in him."

LORD HUGH CECIL said that would be almost worse than his hon. and gallant friend's Amendment. A good many people thought that the original Amendment would have no effect whatever, and he preferred to take the chance that his hon. and gallant friend might be mistaken rather than accept these words, which would quite definitely subject the trust deed to the control of the managers.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said the words proposed by the noble Lord would be governed by the previous words "in accordance with the tenour of the provisions of the trust deed." He imagined that the noble Lord desired to insist upon the verbal interpretation of the trust deed. The main question was whether there was or was not to be a lay element of control as regarded religious education. Under the trust deed of the National Society, which was the trust deed for the Anglican denomination and the Church of England, the clergyman had, practically speaking, the sole control of the religious education in the school. Therefore, unless they declared that the managers should have control, they left in the hands of the parson the sole control of the religious instruction, and all that had been said in the House and in the country about giving a voice to the laity in the parish on the subject of the religious education of the children would come to nothing. If they rejected this Amendment they would give absolute authority to the parson, and to the parson alone. If the Government were going to insist that the trusts were not to be modified at all, they would be giving sole control of religious education, in schools supported by public money, to the principal officiating minister. Therefore, however much they might consider that he was, in point of fact, violating the trust by giving religious teaching not in accordance with the doctrine of the Church of England, yet, according to the Amendment of the noble Lord, they would have no voice in the matter, as the minister would be the sole controlling authority.

*MR. PEMBERTON (Sunderland) said it should be remembered that the Amendment before the Committee ran counter to a very considerable amount of feeling on that side of the House. Some of his hon. friends, at the earlier stages of the Bill had subordinated their own views to the general wishes of their party, and he thought they might reasonably ask others to subordinate their views also. He was strongly opposed to the noble Lord's Amendment, because its object was to make the original Amendment have no effect whatever. He understood that the object of the original Amendment was to give a kind of supervision to the managers over possible aberrations on the part of the clergy. He thought that was reasonable. That power of supervision could only be exercised where some particular man exceeded the spirit of the trust deed under which he was acting. He hoped the House would reject the Amendment of the noble Lord.

Question put and negatived.

*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON was understood to say that he thought it was most desirable that the denominational managers should be associated with the clergymen in the control of religious education in the schools. The Clause as it stood did not provide for it, but he thought that that point might be met by the insertion at the end of line 3 of the word "foundation" before the word "managers." He begged to move that Amendment.

Mr. WHITLEY, upon a point of order said he had submitted an Amendment at a former stage to insert the word "foundation," and it was then suggested that all the managers should act together.

*The CHAIRMAN: That dealt with secular instruction; this is another question.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"At the end of line 3, to insert the word 'foundation.'"—(*Sir James Fergusson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'foundation' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment.

*Mr. COHEN (Islington, E.) agreed with what had fallen from the Prime Minister in the earlier portion of the day, when the right hon. Gentleman said that nobody wished in any way to alter the denominational character of any single school in the kingdom, and further that the fears of the noble Lord the Member for Chichester were groundless. He was of the same opinion. He did not suppose the local education authority would desire to put a Roman Catholic teacher into, for instance, a Jewish school, or a member of the Jewish community into a Roman Catholic school. That being so, what possible objection could there be to putting a word into the Bill the effect of which would be to carry out and make obligatory the result which every hon. Member of the Committee desired. His community desired as little as anybody to place the inculcation of religious instruction exclusively in the hands of the clergy, but there was a great difference between giving clergymen a preponderating control with regard to religious instruction and importing into that religious instruction persons who were not members of the denomination; persons who knew little about it and cared less. That seemed to him so universally recognised that he could not see what objection there could be to the Amendment. A large part of what they regarded as religious instruction in the schools of his community consisted of teaching the Hebrew language. He stated that detail in order that the Committee might see why from the point of view of the community to which he belonged it was necessary that the governing body should be members of that community. For that reason he hoped the Prime Minister and the Government would be able to accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Manchester, which he respectfully submitted carried out and made obligatory that which was the desire, intention and the anticipation of the Government.

Lord HUGH CECIL said that when he contrasted the attitude of the Government now with what they had said in the past it seemed to him absolutely unjustifiable that one denomination should be allowed a voice in the control of the schools of another denomination. He thoroughly approved of this Amendment to the original Amendment, but he hoped a division would not be taken upon it. The only object in dividing at all was to get an expression of opinion, and he thought it would be better to take the division on the Amendment of his hon. and gallant friend in all its naked enormity.

Question put and negatived.

(4.42.) Question put, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 211; Noes, 41. (Division List, No. 452.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther, H. T.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atherley-Jones, L.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon Allen Benjamin
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, Lord Chas. William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Channing, Francis Allston
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Sir Savile
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fenwick, Charles
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Garfit, William
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Graham, Henry Robert
Grant, Corrie
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helder, Augustus
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horner, Frederick William
Horniman, Frederick John
Howard, J. (Midd. Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Jacoby, James Alfred
Kemp, George
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Lambert, George
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lough, Thomas
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Macdona, John Cumming
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Crae, George
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Moulton, John Fletcher
Mount, William Arthur
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Philipps, John Wynford
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Price, Robert John
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Rea, Russell
Reckitt, Harold James
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas (Somerset)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Wallace, Robert
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wylie, Alexander
Younger, William
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney
and Mr. Henry Hobhouse.

NOES.

Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Carew, James Laurence
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Davenport, William Bromley-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tully, Jasper
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton

Tellers for the Noes—
Sir James Fergusson and
Mr. Laurence Hardy.

Mr. TULLY: On a point of order, Sir. This is the only chance I have had to vote, and I have not been counted.

*The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is under a misapprehension. He has been counted. He makes the forty-first.

(4.45.) Sir WILLIAM ANSON moved to leave out sub-Section 3. He explained that the arrangements under the Voluntary Schools Act, 1897, indicated in the sub-Section, would be afterwards provided for by an Amendment in the name of the Prime Minister, and that the financial arrangements indicated last summer would come up as a new Clause. In these circumstances, the sub-Section had no right or place in the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 30, to leave out sub-Section (3)."—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That sub-Section (3) stand part of the Clause."

Mr. WHITLEY asked, as he had not the new Clause by the Prime Minister containing the financial arrangements before him, whether under that the grant would be paid to the county authority, and not in any case to the individual schools.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON said he was not prepared to discuss the new Clause until it came before the Committee. All he said was that the new Clause made it unnecessary for this sub-Section to remain in the Bill.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) asked the First Lord of the Treasury when the Government proposed to go into Committee on the Financial Clause.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he should be glad to consult the convenience of the House on that point.

Mr. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) pointed out that the Resolution might well be discussed before the Committee came to Clause 13.

Mr. WHITLEY said he was under the impression that the new Clause was put down to come after Clause 10. He wished to know whether it would be taken after Clause 10 or at the end of the twenty Clauses of the Bill.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that all the new Clauses would be discussed at the end of the Bill, but the Resolution would be discussed before.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) asked when the Resolution would be put upon the Paper.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Amendment is on the Paper, and the Resolution is practically the same.

Question put and negatived.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said the central fact of this Clause was the appointment of the teachers. The claim of the Opposition was that, as teachers were in future to be paid from public funds, their appointment should be in the hands of a public authority. On this there had been absolutely no concession made, and there had been no adequate defence of the Government position. Teachers were to remain subject to a religious test, because in the opinion of the Government the denominational character of the schools must be maintained, but the alternative to the Government proposal had never, really, been discussed. The Colonial Secretary had made a defence of the system of tests, but the only argument he could bring forward was that, under many School Boards, tests—perhaps not open and avowed, but none the less effective—existed, and that therefore, in pursuance of the principles of religious equality, tests ought to be maintained in the voluntary schools. What did the right hon. Gentleman mean by that? There were no School Boards of any size under which religious tests for teachers were permitted. The only instance in the history of School Boards in which a considerable party had proposed such a thing was when Mr. Athelstan Riley and his friends on the London School Board endeavoured to impose a Church test on teachers, and were utterly smashed at the ensuing election. The defence of the Government was that the policy laid down in the Clause was the only means by which the religious character of the denominational schools could be maintained. But was that the case? The possible alternative had never been really discussed. The proposition that the clergy should be allowed to go into the schools, both voluntary and board, and give whatever religious instruction they chose had in it the elements of a settlement which might be accepted, but the essential part of a settlement on those lines was that first of all there should be complete popular control. It was frequently said that such a settlement was out of the question because Nonconformists and the upholders of School Boards would not, on any account allow the clergymen of religious denominations to go into the board schools. That was entirely contrary to the fact, because when the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich was first placed on the Paper, the authorised representatives of the Free Churches definitely announced that they were ready to consider every possible facility given to denominations for the giving of religious instruction in or out of the school if popular control were first accorded in all schools. The Committee had to deal with two general ideas—the demand for complete popular control, and the demand of the private individual for religious education for his children. Those two ideas were perfectly compatible, but not under the plan of the Government, because popular control was refused. If the appointment of teachers were under popular control it might be left to the other side to settle the exact conditions under which denominational instruction should be given. The central evil of the Clause was the detestable proposition that 60,000 Civil servants whose salaries were to be paid out of public money, were for ever to have a religious test imposed upon them. That was why the opponents of the measure scorned the miserable concessions that had been made, and sometimes in their indignation called them a mockery. They certainly were a mockery compared with the great end they desired, viz., perfect independence for an enormous body of Civil servants, and therefore, they opposed and would continue to oppose the Bill.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said he desired not to go into a general discussion of the Clause, but to say a word on the position in which it left the new authority. The Government had created a new education authority which they said was more to be trusted than an authority elected *ad hoc.* The Clause began by investing the great municipal institutions with this authority, and finished by giving to another authority power to overrule the decisions of the education authority, and Borough and County Councils would be in a position of subordination and humiliation in which they did not stand in regard to any other subject. It was his opinion that the Clause would create much friction, and be a temptation and a provocation to managers to appeal against an authority they disliked. He protested against the introduction of an over-ruling authority as provided by the Clause, because he believed it would lead to mischievous friction, and be injurious to the education of the country.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE supported the protest of his right hon. friend. As the Clause stood it would allow an appeal to the Board of Education on nearly every question of detail of administration. What made the matter worse was that the Government themselves did not intend that to be the case, and, in debate, had constantly limited the jurisdiction of the appeal. Many explanations of intentions upon this point had been made, but they had not found insertion in the Bill, which remained practically unaltered. There ought to be an end of this explaining away of the Bill in a sense contrary to the text. The Board of Education or the county court judge would not go behind the Bill and act on the explanations given in debate: they would abide by the words of the Act. The Government had had their difficulties with their own side, and to meet those difficulties explanations had been given to enlarge the Bill and make it appear more liberal. In fact, the commentaries were much better than the text, and the Government were bound, before the Bill left the House, to put their explanations into the scripture of the Bill. In sanitary matters ordinarily a little town council had supreme authority; where schools were concerned similar powers were withheld from a great County Council simply because of the intrusion of the sectarian element. What had religion to do with the sanitary condition of a building? If it was a question of insanitary air the Council had supreme power; if they blended the insanitary air with Church atmosphere there was an appeal to the Board of Education. The questions asked yesterday with regard to the veto on the teachers' appointment showed that the members of the Government could not agree on the meaning of their own Bill. Support was secured for it by its vagueness. Everybody could see what they wanted in it, and therefore could vote for it. But when it came to be put in operation this vagueness would not do, and the defects of the Bill would come out. Hence it was that they wanted to know exactly what the Bill meant before it left the House of Commons.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) hoped the First Lord of the Treasury would not consider half an hour sufficient in which to discuss the question that Clause 8 stand part of the Bill. He objected to both the form and the substance of the Clause. That was described as dealing with the maintenance of schools, whereas, as a matter of fact, it did nothing of the sort. It was the only Clause in the Bill which professed to set up and define the relations between the local authority and the managers, and its fatal defect was that the principal relations were not definitely stated, but merely inferred. Complaints were frequently made of legislation by reference, but legislation by inference was far worse.

(5.28.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question, 'That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 166; Noes, 72. (Division List No. 453.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen,AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGerald W.(Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford,LordCharlesWilliam
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Butcher, John George
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb,Sir JohnCharlesReady
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,PhillipS (Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury,Rt.Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. JamesHenryCecil
Kemp, George
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol,S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Maxwell,RtHn.SirH.E(Wigt'n
Milner,Rt.Hon.SirFrederickG.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More,Robt. Jasper(Shropshire)
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col. John P. (Galway,N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley, Hon. M. W.(Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde(BethnalGreen)
Ritchie,Rt.Hon.Chas.Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson,Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith,JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thompson,Dr EC(Monagh'n,N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirCEH(Sheffield)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col. A.C.E.(Taunton
Williams,RtHnJPowell-(Birm.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wylie, Alexander
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc., Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert

Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

(5.38.) Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 165; Noes, 69. (Division List No. 454.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beckett, Ernest William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Beresford, L'rd Charles William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander, Glasgow
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helder, Augustus
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale
Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Milner,RtHn.Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
More,Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col.John P.(Galway,N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley,Hn. M.W. (Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Saunderson,RtHn.Col.Edw.J.
Seely,MajJ.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,James Parker(Lanarks.
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHnJ.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Thompson,DrEC(Monagh'n,N
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson,SirWilliam Edw.M
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirCEH(Sheffield
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt-ColA.C.E.(Taunton
Williams RtHnJ Powell-(Birm
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson-Todd,Wm. H.(Yorks.)
Wylie, Alexander
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon.SirWilliam
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne,Rt.Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter,Rt.Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorgeSmyth
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. JohnWilliam
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomson, F. W. (York,W. R.)
Wallace, Robert
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams,Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

It being after half-past five of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter before Six of the clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 3rd November, 1902.

SAT FIRST.

THE LORD BRAYBROOKE

Sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother.

THE LORD CHEYLESMORE

Sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

LANARKSHIRE (MIDDLE WARD DISTRICT) WATER ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL (No. 182).

DUMBARTON CORPORATION (FURTHER POWERS) ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL No. 183).

WICK BURGH EXTENSION ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL (No. 184).

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a, to be printed, and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2^a and reported from the Committee.

RICHMOND HILL (PRESERVATION OF VIEW) BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

SOUTH-EASTERN AND LONDON, CHATHAM AND DOVER RAILWAYS BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments made by the Lords to the Amendments made by the Commons, agreed to.

BAKER STREET AND WATERLOO RAILWAY BILL [H.L.],

CHARING CROSS, EUSTON, AND HAMPSTEAD RAILWAY (Nos. 1 AND 3) BILL [H.L.], and

CHARING CROSS, EUSTON, AND HAMPSTEAD RAILWAY (No. 2) BILL [H.L.], now

CHARING CROSS, EUSTON, AND HAMPSTEAD RAILWAY BILL [H.L.],

EDGWARE AND HAMPSTEAD RAILWAY BILL [H.L.],

NORTH-WEST LONDON RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

BROMPTON AND PICCADILLY CIRCUS RAILWAY (NEW LINES, ETC.,) BILL [H.L.].

Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the following Papers having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI., viz.

ARMY (REMOUNTS).

I. Minutes of evidence taken before the Court of Enquiry on the administration of the Army Remount Department; with appendices. (October 17.)

II. Reports of officers appointed by the Commander-in-Chief to inquire into the working of the Remount Department abroad. (October 17.)

NAVY (COURTS-MARTIAL).

Returns of the number of courts-martial held, and summary punishments inflicted during the year 1901. (October 18.)

MINES AND QUARRIES (GENERAL REPORT AND STATISTICS FOR 1901) (PART III. OUTPUT).

General Report and Statistics relating to the output and value of the minerals raised in the United Kingdom, the amount and value of the metals produced, and the exports and imports of minerals. (October 18.)

CHINA, No. 2 (1902).

Despatch from His Majesty's Special Commissioner, enclosing the treaty between Great Britain and China, signed at Shanghai, 5th September, 1902. (October 21.)

CROFTER HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS, 1886–87.

Report to the Secretary for Scotland by the Crofters Commission on the social condition of the people of Lewis in 1901 (October 23.)

STATISTICS (COLONIES).

I. Tables relating to the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom, Part XXV., for the year 1900. (October 24.)

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

II. Abstract for the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1887 to 1901. Thirty-ninth number. (October 24.)

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

Return for the month of August, 1902. (October 24.)

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 2907. China (Nanking). (October 18.)

No. 2908. Japan (South Formosa). (Supplementary). (October 24.)

No. 2909. United States (Cuba). (October 24.)

No. 2910. Italy (Ancona). (October 24.)

IRELAND (TYPHOID FEVER IN LIMERICK CITY AND PRISON, JULY, AUGUST, AND SEPTEMBER, 1902.

Reports made by Stewart Wodehouse, Esq., M.D., Medical Member of the General Prisons Board for Ireland and by Sir J. Acheson MacCullagh, M.D., Medical Inspector to the Local Government Board for Ireland. (October 24.)

AFRICA, No. 4 (1902).

Report by the Mombasa - Victoria (Uganda) Railway Committee on the Progress of the Works, 1901–1902; with two maps and section. (October 27.)

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

I. Rules to be observed in planning and fitting up public elementary schools. (October 28.)

II. Precedents of trust deeds settled for Church of England schools, British schools, Established Church of Scotland schools, Wesleyan schools, Free Church (Scotland) schools, Roman Catholic schools, Jewish schools, Episcopal Church (Scotland) schools, and undenominational schools referred to in the Revised Code of 1870. (October 30.)

III. Statement under administrative counties and county boroughs of public elementary schools which have received building grants, showing, in each case, the amount of such building grants and the amount subscribed by the promoters at the time (so far as records exist); also, in the case of schools which have been transferred to the School Board or closed, the year of transfer or closure; with explanatory memorandum and appendix. (October 31.)

COLONIES (ANNUAL).

No. 369. Hong Kong (1901). (October 28.)

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1902.

Conference between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Prime Ministers of the Self-governing Colonies, June to August, 1902. (October 28.)

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.

Return showing the unclaimed shares of all prize money, slave and pirate bounties, salvage awards, Parliamentary grants, war gratuities, and other monies distributed by the Admiralty, from the 1st January, 1855, to 31st March, 1902. (October 30.)

POLICE (METROPOLIS).

Report of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, for the year 1901. (October 31.)

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.

Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 30th September, 1902. (November 1.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

COLONIES (ANNUAL).

No. 370. Cocos Islands, 1902.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

Return for the month of September, 1902.

RAILWAYS (CONTINUOUS BRAKES).

Return by the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom, for six months ended the 30th June, 1902.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

I. Thirtieth Annual Report, 1900–1901. Supplement containing Report of the Medical Officer for 1900–1901 on Lead Poisoning and Water Supplies.

II. Thirty-first Annual Report, 1901–1902. Supplement containing Report of the Medical Officer for 1901–1902.

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES.

Area, houses and population, also population classified by ages, condition as to marriage, occupations, birthplaces, and infirmities for counties of—Suffolk; Leicester; Somerset.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

WINTER ASSIZES ACTS, 1876–1877.

Seven Orders in Council of 11th August, 1902, relating to the ensuing winter assizes.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Five Orders in Council of 11th August, 1902, entitled respectively—

The Cyprus Courts of Justice Amendment Order, 1902;

The Uganda Order in Council, 1902;

The British Central Africa Order in Council, 1902.

The East Africa Order in Council, 1902; and

The Eastern African Protectorates (Court of Appeal) Order in Council, 1902.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Two Orders in Council of 11th August, 1902, approving Pilotage Byelaws for the ports of Cardiff and Waterford respectively.

EXTRADITION ACTS, 1870–1895.

Order in Council of 15th September, 1902, giving effect to a Declaration, signed 26th June, 1901, supplementary to the Extradition Treaty of 3rd December, 1873, between Great Britain and Austria-Hungary.

INEBRIATES ACTS, 1879–1899 (INEBRIATES COMMITTED UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE LICENSING ACT, 1902).

Regulations made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department by virtue of Section 20 of the Inebriates Act, 1898, for carrying into effect the provisions of Section 5 of the Licensing Act, 1902, respecting the detention of inebriates committed to retreats.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACT, 1894 AND 1896.

Two Orders, dated the 1st day of September, 1902, entitled the Bristol (Cumberland and Tidal Basin) Foreign Animals Wharf Revocation Order of 1902 and the Bristol (Cumberland Basin) Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1902.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1899.

Minutes sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Technical Instruction Act, 1889, for the counties of: Huntingdon (second minute); East Suffolk (seventh minute); Leicester (seventh minute); Oxford (eighth minute); Southampton (tenth minute).

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877.

Statutes made by the University of Cambridge, and sealed on the 27th May, 1902, amending the statutes of the University. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 179.)

MARGATE PIER AND HARBOUR COMPANY (1812).

Report and Statement of Accounts for the year ended 5th April, 1902. Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT BILL
(No. 180).

AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL
(No. 181).

Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and to be printed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The DUKE of DEVONSHIRE): My Lords, I understand that it is necessary or desirable that the House should meet for purely formal business in connection with a Provisional Order Bill on this day week. I understand, also, that the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack, the Lord Chancellor, proposes that the House should meet for judicial business on the following Tuesday—namely, on the 11th instant. But as far as I am aware, there will not be any ordinary business taken before this day fortnight. I move, therefore, that the House on its rising stand adjourned till Monday next.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 3rd November, 1902.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

WATER PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Reported with an Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered tomorrow.

PETITIONS.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petitions for abolition of restrictions: from Dumbarton; and St. Ives; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions for alteration: from Dumbarton; and St. Ives; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions from St. Aidans, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (LIGHTHOUSES) BILL.

Petition from Cardiff, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION IN TRADE.

Petition for legislation: from Edinburgh; Dumbarton; and St. Ives; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

Copy presented, of Returns of Proceedings during the month of September, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS (CONTINUOUS BRAKES).

Copy presented, of Return by the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom on the progress made in the use of Continuous Brakes, etc., for the six months ending 30th June, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MERCANTILE MARINE (SEAMEN EMPLOYED).

Copy presented. of Return of the number, ages, ratings, and Nationalities of the seamen employed on the 31st March, 1901, on vessels registered under Part I. of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, in the British Islands [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL SERVICES (ADDITIONAL ESTIMATE, 1902–03).

Estimate presented of the amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1903, as a Grant-in-Aid to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony for Expenses consequent upon the termination of the War [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 365.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Copy presented, of Supplement to the Thirtieth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1900–1901, in continuation of the Report of the Medical Officer for 1900–1901, on Lead Poisoning and Water Supplies [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Copy presented, of Supplement to the Thirty-first Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1901–02, containing the Report of the Medical Officer for 1901–02 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CENSUS (ENGLAND AND WALES), 1901.

Copy presented, of Census of England and Wales, 1901 (Counties of Suffolk, Leicester, and Somerset [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 370 (Cocos Islands, Annual Report for 1902) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES

Aird (Stornoway) School Playground.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that although 300 children attend Aird School, in the parish of Stornoway, the playground is devoid of shelter; and will he ascertain whether some kind of protection from the weather can be provided.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The Department does not in all cases require that outside shelters should be provided in the playgrounds, nor is opinion unanimous as to the advantage of such shelters for use in severe weather. As at present advised, my Lords hold that it is a matter which may be left to the School Board with such suggestions as His Majesty's inspector may make.

Lewis Local Government Board Inquiry.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Lord Advocate if he will state when the inspecting officers of the Local Government Board last visited the Island of Lewis for the purpose of inquiring into questions affecting the public health.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The Board's inspecting officer was last in the Island of Lewis for the purpose referred to in May of the present year.

Standard of Ventilation for Cotton-weaving Sheds.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will consider the advisability of prescribing, under Clause 7, Section 2, of the Factory and Workshops Act, 1901, a standard of sufficient ventilation in cotton-weaving sheds, other than those in which the humidity of the atmosphere is artificially produced.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) The question is one which I shall have to consider at an early date. The subject of ventilation in factories and workshops has been for some time under inquiry; and a very important Report has been laid before Parliament, which will be published within a few days.

Indian Railway Contracts with German Firms.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs): To ask the Secretary of State for India if the price of locomotives recently ordered in Germany by the East India Railway Company included delivery in India, or are they delivered f.o.b. at a German port; in the latter case will he recommend that they be shipped by British liners whose rates are similar to those current in German companies trading to India.

(*Answered by Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*) I am afraid that I must refer the hon. Member to the East India Railway Company for the information which he desires on the subject of the locomotives ordered in Germany by that Company. With regard to the latter part of the Question, I may say that the Government Director will undoubtedly use his influence, so far as it may be compatible with a due regard for the interests of the India taxpayer, in favour of the employment of British firms.

Navy Contracts—Preserves.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, whether he can state what firms have been entrusted with contracts for the supply of preserves for seamen, and the quantity contracted for by each firm; whether the contracts contain a fair wages clause; whether any part of the supply has yet been sent in; and whether any of the supplies have been rejected as not being up to the standard in weight or quality.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) It is not considered to be for the public interest to furnish the names of the successful tenderers. Contracts for preserves, in common with all other Admiralty contracts, contain a Fair Wages Clause. O the total quantity of preserves sent in, a small portion, representing about 3 per cent. of the whole, has been rejected as not in accordance with the requirements of the contract.

Naval Shipbuilding—Designs of Scouts.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what progress has been made in determining the designs and arrangements for building the Scouts; and whether he can give particulars as to their dimensions, speed, armament, and coal carrying capacity.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) Designs have been received from several firms, and orders for four ships of the new Scout Class have been placed with four of them, conditional upon certain modifications being accepted by them. A speed of 25 knots will be obtained. The armament will consist of ten 12-pounder and eight small automatic guns. The coal supplied will be sufficient for 3,000 knots at 10 knots speed. The exact dimensions of the displacements have not been determined finally.

Fatal Gun Accident at Portsmouth.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughboro'): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been called to the circumstances attending the death of Seaman Cosham, which occurred during the firing of a Royal salute at Portsmouth in August last; whether there was a commissioned officer in charge of the men engaged in firing the salute when the accident occurred; and, if so, will he state why he was not required to give evidence at the inquest which was subsequently held; was the position occupied by Cosham at the time of the accident, viz., astride the muzzle of the gun, in accordance with the regulations laid down by the Admiralty for such occasions; whether there were sufficient warrant officers present to keep all the men engaged under observation; if he can state how many accidents have occurred during the last ten years to men engaged in firing salutes; and what steps the Admiralty have taken, or intend to take, to ensure the observance of regulations on such occasions in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Arnold-Forster.*) A Court of Inquiry has investigated the circumstances attending the accident referred to. There was no commissioned officer in charge of the saluting party, which was placed in charge of a gunner, in accordance with the regulations laid down by the Admiralty for firing salutes. As the men composing a saluting party have always had previous training in their duties, it is not considered that the presence of other warrant officers is necessary. The position astride the muzzle of the gun occupied by Able Seaman Cosham was not in accordance with the regulations, which require that the gun shall be run in for sponging, and orders have been given for the strict observance of this rule in future. I am unable without longer notice to state what accidents have occurred during the last ten years to men engaged in firing salutes; but if the hon. Member will repeat this inquiry next week I will endeavour to give him the information.

Athlone Income Tax Appeals.

MR. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state the number of appeals from income tax assessments in the Athlone district which have been lodged this year, also the increased amount assessed over the past year; and whether he is aware that dissatisfaction exists among traders in the Athlone district at the manner in which the surveyor is increasing their assessments.

(*Answered by Mr. Ritchie.*) The number of appeals for 1902–3 has been 184. The amounts of profits assessed has been £211,160, as against £208,682 in 1901–2, an increase of about £2,500. The Board of Inland Revenue are not aware of any dissatisfaction among the traders of Athlone at the way in which the surveyor has increased their assessments.

Railway Carriage of Inflammable Liquids.

MR. SCOTT MONTAGU (Hampshire, New Forest): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has yet approached the railway companies with reference to the carriage of petroleum spirit and other inflammable liquids; and, if so, with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I have been in communication with the Railway Companies' Association in this matter, and am informed that a meeting to discuss the questions involved has been arranged for tomorrow between the general managers of the several railways and a deputation representing those interested in this traffic.

Lurgan Post Office.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): To ask the Postmaster General whether he can state when a commencement will be made in the erection of the new Post Office in Lurgan.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) It is intended to commence the building in the course of next year.

London Post Office—Holiday Allowances.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that officers of the London Post Office, working on Bank Holiday, 25th instant, have been refused by the Heads of the Department payment in lieu, and are only allowed leave under such restrictions as to lessen considerably the value of the holiday; and whether he will give instructions for carrying out the recommendations of the Tweedmouth Committee, which lays down that an officer that cannot be spared on a Bank Holiday shall have the choice of remuneration or leave in lieu.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I have no reason to think that my directions on this matter are not being properly carried out. If any officer feels aggrieved by them, he should memorialise me in the usual way, and his case will receive my attention.

Postal Arrangements with the United States.

MR. SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Postmaster General whether he is aware that the Express Companies in the United States have declined to facilitate the arrangements made between the British Post Office and the American Express Company; whether loss will be incurred on many parcels forwarded under the new arrangement; and will he say whether the British Post Office bears any, and, if so, what portion of this loss; and, seeing that the British Post Office undertakes free delivery of parcels to the consignees in the United States, including payment of the United States customs duty, will he say how it protects itself from loss, should the required 10 per cent. deposit prove insufficient; and, seeing that the United States customs duty is in nearly all cases far in excess of the amount which would be covered by a 10 per cent. deposit, has the British Post Office arranged for any special facilities to be given for the transit of goods through the United States customs.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I am not aware that the Express Companies in the United States have declined to facilitate the arrangements made with the American Express Company for the exchange of parcels with the United States, nor have I any reason to suppose that the Company will be unable to carry out the obligations into which it has entered. I do not know whether any of these obligations will involve the Company in loss; but they will entail none on the British Post Office. The senders of parcels which are to be delivered free in the United States sign an undertaking which makes them legally responsible for the customs charges. It is this legal responsibility which protects the Post Office in this case, as in others of the same kind. Proper facilities have been secured for the transit of British postal parcels through the United States Customs.

Enniskillen Postal Staff's Grievances.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): To ask the Postmaster General if he has received a petition from the sorting clerks and telegraphists at Enniskillen, dated 11th September, praying for a revision of their attendances on the ground of the number of early morning duties consequent upon the number of female appointments at that office; and seeing that such duties have since been made divided, and the necessity for the meal relief so avoided, will he seek to provide a remedy by placing Enniskillen on the same basis as other similar towns by reducing the number of female appointments.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The memorial has been received and duly considered. It is not found practicable to make any further improvement in the attendances required of the staff at Enniskillen. The men rotate monthly on the early morning duty, and there is nothing unusual in the arrangements at present in force. The circumstances do not call for a reduction of the number of appointments for women.

Dublin-Mullingar Railway Rates.

MR. KENNEDY (Westmeath N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction has been called to the fact that the directors of the Midland Great Western Railway Company of Ireland have reduced their rates for freight of coal between Dublin and Mullingar by rail to a rate per ton less than the tolls paid by boat owners to the same Company for each ton of coal carried on the canal; and whether the Department will exercise its power of appearing before the Railway and Canal Commissioners to have the Canal tolls revised with a view to preserving for the public competition between the two lines of traffic.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Representations have been made to the Department in this matter and are at present under consideration.

South African War—Transport—Overcrowding on the "Drayton Grange."

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he has received any telegraphic summary or information from the Colonial authorities representative of the Army as to the overcrowding of the "Drayton Grange;" if so, will he lay it upon the Table; and whether he will undertake to do the same with the Report whenever it may be received by him from Australia.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) No official Report has yet been received from the Colonial authorities as to the inquiry into the case of the "Drayton Grange." I cannot undertake to make any pledges in respect of such Report until I have seen it.

Volunteer Artillery Armament.

MR. LODER (Brighton): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state what steps are being taken to put the heavy batteries of the Volunteer force on a footing of efficiency; what progress has been made towards re-arming these batteries; how many 40-pounder guns have been replaced by 4·7 guns, and how many 16-pounder guns by 15-pounder B.L. guns; and whether any 15-pounder guns have either been issued or promised to any corps of Volunteer artillery.

MR. LODER: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the new 15-pounder B.L. guns, when issued, will be horsed as R.F.A. guns; and whether he can state whether Volunteer batteries, at present horsed as mobile position batteries, but not attached to any Army corps, will have to give up their present method of horsing their guns, and revert to the employment of heavy horses led by drivers on foot.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Twenty-two batteries of 4·7-inch guns have been issued to Volunteers, and a considerable number are on order. The guns of eleven 40-pounder R.B.L. batteries have been replaced by 4·7-inch guns. No 16-pounder guns have been replaced by 15-pounder guns. Two batteries of 15-pounder B.L. guns have been issued to the Honourable Artillery Company. As regards field guns, the whole question of their issue to the Volunteers and the method of draught is under consideration.

Hong Kong Building Ordinances.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any arrangements have yet been made to meet the increase in building in Hong Kong by the appointment of additional inspectors; and, if so, will he say how many inspectors are now appointed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) The Colonial Government have asked that two additional overseers may be sent out from this country to assist in performing the duties imposed upon the Public Works Department by the building ordinances. Candidates for these posts are under consideration, and it is hoped to send out two overseers at an early date.

West Africa—Importation of Over-Proof Spirits.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that over-proof spirits, containing from 1·26 to 4·31 per cent. of fusil oil, while ·5 per cent. of that oil is injurious, are being imported into West Africa; and will he say what steps are being taken to prevent this importation.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) The figures quoted by the hon. Member are based on a statement made by the Governor of Lagos, Sir William MacGregor, in his message to the Legislative Council in March last. The over-proof spirits in which a deleteriously high proportion of fusil oil was found were not gin, rum, brandy, or whisky (which the Government chemist, after a long series of analyses, has found to be free from injurious ingredients) but alcohol. The Governor is of opinion that alcohol containing a noxious substance like fusil oil in deleterious quantity should be seized and dealt with in such a way that it should not reach the public; but fresh legislation is required to give the Government the necessary powers, and the Governor has informed his Council that a Bill for this purpose will be introduced for their consideration. Inquiry will be made of the Governor as to the progress of the measure referred to.

North Nigeria—Importation of Liquors.

COLONEL WELBY: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that two years ago Sir F. Luard publicly stated that steps would be taken to prevent by prohibition rates the importation ofliquors into the African Interior viâ the Lagos Railway; and whether he can say if these rates have been imposed, and with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain.*) The importation into Northern Nigeria of spirituous liquors for sale to natives is absolutely prohibited. The present terminus of the Lagos Railway is some seventy miles from the boundary of Lagos and Northern Nigeria, so that, even apart from the general prohibition, the question of direct importation by railway does not arise. The rates at present charged for the conveyance of spirits on the railway are high; higher in fact than the charges for conveyance by other means (carriers and canoes). For instance, the railway rate for spirits from Lagos to Ibadan (the terminus) is 47s. a ton, and the charge for conveyance by carriers, etc., is 40s. 4½d.

Taxation of Personal Property—Foreign and Colonial Systems.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, E.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can say when the Return (Personal Property Contribution to Local Taxation Abroad), ordered by the House, August, 1901, will be presented.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The Return referred to is one setting out the system under which personal property is made to contribute towards local taxation by means of a local income tax or local death duty in the following countries: France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Holland, United States of America, and in all British self-governing Colonies and the Channel Islands. The particulars required for the Return have been asked for by the Foreign and Colonial Offices. Reports have been received by the Foreign Office from France, Prussia, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and United States. These were sent by the Foreign Office to the Local Government Board, who, in returning them, suggested the desirability of further information being obtained on certain points from His Majesty's representatives abroad. The Foreign Office have taken steps for this purpose. The Colonial Office have sent to the Board Reports from all the self-governing Colonies except Cape Colony, Victoria, Tasmania, and New Zealand. These Reports are in course of examination, and will be sent on to the Foreign Office at an early date. A Report as to Jersey has also been forwarded to the Foreign Office. The Return will be made as soon as the information is complete.

Spalding Grammar School.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the Spalding Grammar School, No 8050, is recognised under the Board of Education as a secondary day school, Division B, for grants from 16th September last.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The managers are being informed that the scheme of work has been approved; but that the formal recognition of the school for grants cannot be given until a satisfactory report has been received from the inspector.

(2.15.) *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

Compensation to Boers for War Losses.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any limit of time is fixed within which applications for compensation must be lodged by the Boers who suffered through the military operations in the Transvaal or Orange River Colony; and will he state the nature of the regulations on the subject, and in what manner they have been made known.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): A limit of time was fixed by successive notices in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony *Gazettes* in regard to claims lodged with the military authorities. It has been agreed to waive the time limit where the claimant can show that his failure to comply with the provisions of the notices was due to no negligence of his own. Relief in respect of the war losses, other than those arising from requisitions, suffered by the Boers through the military operations, is being given under Article 10 of the Terms of Surrender, and no time has so far been fixed within which claims in respect of such war losses should be submitted.

Army Commissions—Age Regulations.

COLONEL BAIN (Cumberland, Egremont): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the position of the officers of Militia and Yeomanry who were given commissions in the Army for services in the field, and who, on account of age, are placed at a disadvantage as regards their future career in the Army; and, if so, will he state what steps he proposes to take to place them on an equal footing with officers gazetted to the Army from Sandhurst.

*LORD STANLEY: Those officers who, on first appointment to commissions granted as rewards for active service, were placed at a disadvantage in respect of age will be considered, after they have served at least three or four years, for promotion to the rank of captain in vacancies which would not be filled by regimental promotion in the ordinary course. Regard will be given to age as well as to efficiency. Four officers have been given captaincies in the garrison regiment, and seven have been appointed lieutenants.

New Cunarders.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the designs for the two twenty-five-knot vessels to be built by the Cunard Company, for which the Government is to find the money, and also to subsidise, are to be subject to the approval of the Admiralty.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): Yes, Sir. So far as naval requirements are concerned, the answer is in the affirmative.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: Is it the intention to fit these ships with water-tube boilers, of which the Admiralty so much approve?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am not aware that that arises out of the Question.

SIR WILLIAM ALLAN: Certainly it does.

Madras Railway—Preference for German Steamship Owners.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, whether the Madras Railway Company is a Company guaranteed by the Indian Government; whether it has on its board an official of the India

Office acting as Government director; whether all tenders for materials and goods consigned to India and for freight are submitted to the approval of the India Office through him; whether payments by the Company for the same are sanctioned by the India Office before payment; whether the India Office takes one-half of the surplus profits of the railway; and whether the Government has the right to take over the railway on 1st April, 1907; and is he aware that about 660 tons of railway material for the Madras railways were shipped from Middlesborough by the German steamship "Rudesheimer" on 4th July, and about 1,280 tons by the German steamship "Goldenfels" on 25th June; can he state whether all the locomotives shipped from Middlesborough for the Madras railways since 1886 have been carried by German steamships, and whether tenders for this freight have been asked from British shipowners, as in the case of other guaranteed Indian railways; if not, can he state why this preference has been given by an Indian Government railway to German firms; and will he take steps to give British steamship owners the opportunity of tendering for such freight in future.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I am afraid that in my recent answer to the hon. Member on this subject, I failed to convey to him the difference between a Government railway on the one hand, and a Company's railway on the other. Both classes of railways exist in India, and the Madras Railway belongs to the latter class. It is therefore managed by a Board of Directors, and all tenders for stores and freight are dealt with by them, and are not submitted for the approval of the India Office. It is true that the payment of interest is guaranteed by the Government of India, and that the Government Director of Railways has a seat at the Board; and his influence has been, and will be, used in favour of British industries, so far as may be consistent with a due regard for the interests of the Indian taxpayer. Beyond this, and except for the purpose of safeguarding Indian interests, I cannot undertake to interfere in the management of the Company in these matters unless I have specific evidence to show that partiality or undue preference has been shown either to those tendering, or in the manner of inviting tenders. In the present case, I am informed that tenders were invited in the usual way.

Delagoa Bay.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether any negotiations have recently been or are now in progress with a view to securing British management for the harbour of and railway from Delagoa Bay.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord CRANBORNE, Rochester): No such negotiations have recently been or are now in progress.

Appropriation of Supply—Terminal Charges for South Africa.

MR. M'CRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, on what authority expenditure is being incurred and issues are made from the Treasury for Terminal charges for South Africa, including transport for returning troops and gratuities to the soldiers; and, seeing that no sums were included in the Estimates for the current year for these purposes, will he say what opportunity will be given for consideration of the necessary Votes in Supply.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The expenditure on terminal services is being incurred with the full cognisance of the Treasury out of the aggregate of existing Army Votes, in accordance with the power conferred by the 5th Section of the annual Appropriation Act. I understand that a Paper will be laid before the House at once purporting to show the anticipated redistribution of funds.

MR. M'CRAE: Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that the practice of transferring Votes from one head to another applies in this case, where the amount so transferred is about ten millions; and does he think that that is a proper system of controlling the national expenditure?

*MR. RITCHIE: It is the usual practice, and is authorised by Act of Parliament.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is it not a fact that the practice authorised by Parliament is that the Treasury may only transfer what is saved on one Vote to another Vote in the same class?

*MR. RITCHIE: If the hon. Member desires any further information he should put down a Question on the Paper.

Mayoral Silver Coronation Medals.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, how many silver medals have been issued since His Majesty's Coronation to the heads of municipalities in the United Kingdom; and what was the cost of each medal.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): These Medals are the personal gift of the King, and have been bestowed on such municipal officers as it has pleased His Majesty to direct. My knowledge in the matter does not go beyond the fact that I have, by His Majesty's commands, been the medium of distributing the medals to all the Mayors of the Boroughs of England and Wales.

Workmen's Compensation Act—Hartlepool County Court Medical Referee.

MR. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether he is aware that Dr. Frederick Morrison, the Medical Referee for the Hartlepool County Court Circuit, appointed by the Home Office under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, appeared as a medical witness for the respondent employers in a case under the Act entitled Peart v. Furness, Withy & Co., and in two similar cases tried at the West Hartlepool County Court, on 17th October; that, in consequence of Dr. Morrison so appearing, the Judge sitting as Arbitrator had to call in another medical practitioner as medical referee; and will he say whether it is in accordance with the rules under the Act for a medical referee so to act; and, if so, will he take steps to amend such rules so as to avoid a repetition of such a state of things, and, if it is not in accordance with the rules, will he take steps to remove the name of Dr. Morrison from the list of medical referees.

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: The conditions on which a Medical Referee holds his appointment under the Workmen's Compensation Act preclude his holding any appointment from an employer or body of employers or workmen which would involve attendance on workmen who come within the provisions of the Act. But it must occasionally happen that a referee, in the course of his ordinary practice, attends a case in which a claim under the Act afterwards arises; and when that happens the rule is that he must not act as referee in that case, but that another referee must be called in. I understand that this is what occurred in the cases mentioned in the hon. Member's Question, and I am assured by the Judge that Dr, Morrison acted with perfect independence and integrity.

Abertysswg Miners' Gallantry.

SIR CHARLES M'LAREN (Leicestershire, Bosworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the gallantry of four men, who, in order to save life after the colliery explosion at Abertysswg, at once descended the pit, notwithstanding the risk from afterdamp, and to the fact that by their efforts nearly twenty lives were ultimately saved; and will he say whether the Albert Medal is given in such cases; and, if not, whether he will consider whether it may be awarded to miners who voluntarily risk their lives in rescuing others.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Rhondda): At the same time may I ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the successful efforts to save life after the recent explosion at the Abertysswg Colliery in South Wales, resulting from the action of certain miners, who at once descended the pit, and at the risk of their lives began the work of rescuing the men still living from the firedamp, to the injury of their health; will he say whether such cases are within his power to recognise by the award of the Albert Medal; and, if so, whether he will give it to those first down the pit, if the facts are laid before him.

*MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: The suggestion made by hon. Members has already been before me, and I have looked very carefully into the facts of the case. I fully appreciate the praiseworthy and courageous conduct of each one of the men referred to; but I do not find—and I say it with regret—that the case is one which I should feel justified in submitting to the King for an award of the Albert Medal.

Canadian Store Cattle—Restrictions on Importation.

SIR JOHN LENG: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether his attention has been called to a statement made by Mr. Colmer, Secretary to the High Commissioner for Canada, that during the last ten years not a single case of pleuropneumonia has been discovered among cattle in the Dominion, and that about 1,000,000 Canadian cattle have been imported into this country in that period, and that Mr. Sewell Read has pronounced Canadian cattle the healthiest in the world; whether, in view of the diminution in the supply of British stores he will take steps to abrogate the embargo on the sale of Canadian live stores in English and Scottish markets.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. Not only Canadian stores, but those of all countries alike are prohibited from entering this country by the provisions of the Act of 1896, and I have no intention of proposing to repeal them.

MR. ARCHDALE (Fermanagh, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say what is the estimated amount of loss suffered by the farmers of this country through the last attack of foot and mouth disease caused by the importation of cattle from abroad?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the Question.

House Sites for Shetland Crofters.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the difficulty experienced by cottars in the Sandwick district of Shetland, and throughout the Highland crofting counties, in obtaining land for house sites, will the Government consider the desirability of introducing legislation such as will give the local authority compulsory powers to obtain land at fair rentals for the requirements of the people.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): No representation has been received from the cottars of the Sandwick district of Shetland. The Government do not consider it desirable to introduce legislation in the sense contemplated by the hon. Member.

MR. WEIR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Shetland fishermen have to pay at the rate of £8 per acre for house sites? I hope he will bring it under the notice of the Secretary for Scotland.

Scottish Congested Districts Board—Expenditure on New Holdings.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state the amount expended by the Congested Districts Board, since its formation, in the acquisition of land in each of the six crofting counties for the purpose of creating new holdings.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The hon. Member's question does not admit of any categorical answer which would not be in a sense misleading. I may, however, state that the amount expended in actual purchase of land has been for Syre (Sutherland), £10,546, and for Barra (Inverness), £7,500; and, further, that all the operations in the direction of extending small holdings, including purchase, have cost up to date nearly £39,000. This includes loans and other repayable sums, but is exclusive of liabilities of considerable amount which have not yet matured.

Scottish Fishermen and the Three Mile Limit.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, in view of the feeling amongst fishermen in the north of Scotland that the three-mile limit should be extended, he will state on what ground he declines to recommend that the signatories to the North Sea Convention be approached on the subject.

*Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The hon. Member raises a point of policy in regard to negotiations with Foreign Powers into which I must decline to enter in reply to a Question.

Congestion in the Island of Lewis.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if the Secretary for Scotland will consider the expediency of deputing an inspector of the Local Government Board to visit the Island of Lewis, for the purpose of inspecting congested districts and conferring with the local authority, the medical officers of health, and the sanitary inspector, with a view to the removal of hovels such as that in which a man named Mackay recently died of typhus fever, in the district of Ness, Island of Lewis.

*Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The general question of the sanitary condition of the Lewis is receiving the consideration of the Local Government Board. Certain aspects of the question are dealt with in the special Report on the Lewis by the Crofter's Commission which has just been presented to Parliament, and if the Secretary for Scotland thinks further information is required, he will consider what course it is expedient to pursue. I understand the local authority have already taken action, with a view to the destruction of the house in which Mackay dwelt.

Mr. WEIR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Local Government Board have not taken the trouble to send a single inspector of that Board to the Island of Lewis—the most congested district in the Highlands of Scotland.

Portness Harbour, Island of Lewis.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Congested Districts Board have yet been able to obtain from Sir John Wolfe Barry, C.E., a report on the condition of Portness Harbour, Island of Lewis; and, if not, will he say when the question is likely to receive that gentleman's attention.

*Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Sir John Wolfe Barry intimated, on 17th October, his regret that his engagements will not permit of his visiting Port Ness Harbour. The Congested Districts Board are considering as to another engineer.

Consignments of Arms to Ireland—Circular to Birmingham Manufacturers.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that [quantities of small arms and ammunition are being despatched from Birmingham to Ireland, and that a circular on the subject has been issued to Birmingham manufacturers by the chief constable of that city; and will he state what steps are being taken, under the Peace Preservation Act of 1881, to prevent such arms and ammunition from falling into the hands of unauthorised persons.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): Small arms and ammunition are consigned from Birmingham in the ordinary course of trade. The Act of 1881 and Orders in Council issued thereunder, prescribe the conditions upon which arms and ammunition shall be admitted into Ireland. A few firms in Birmingham had omitted, from ignorance of the law, to comply with these conditions, and the Circular in question was issued to direct their attention to these statutory requirements. The police are aware of the names and addresses of persons in Ireland to whom arms are consigned by manufacturers and dealers, and all necessary precautions are taken to ensure that only authorised persons shall keep arms. The provisions of the Act of 1881 and of the regulations issued thereunder are clear and stringent, and there is no reason whatever to suppose that they are ineffectual for the purposes for which they were designed.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): Is it not a fact that the great bulk of these arms have been sent to Belfast for the Orange rioters?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is not a proper Question to put.

Irish Congested Districts Board—Purchases of Land.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many acres of land have been purchased by the Congested Districts Board from January, 1900, to the present date; how many acres have been divided amongst tenant purchasers, and how many acres remain undivided in the hands of the Board.

MR. WYNDHAM: I hope to have this information by Thursday next, when I will communicate it to the hon. Member.

Mohill Rural District Finance.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been called to the statement of Mr. Thomas Mahon, at the last quarterly meeting of the Mohill District Council, that an unexpended balance of £3,000 to the credit of the Mohill Rural District has been appropriated by the county at large; and whether, in view of the unanimous resolution of the District Council on this subject, the Local Government Board will direct a sworn inquiry into the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: The statement in question has been referred by the Board to the auditor of the county accounts with a view to his investigating the matter, and, if necessary, taking such steps as will safeguard the interests of the Rural District Council.

MR. TULLY: Why not have a sworn inquiry at which evidence can be taken?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am investigating the matter.

Cork Exhibition—The Chief Secretary's Visit.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether any disturbance took place in the City of Cork on the occasion of his visit to the Exhibition; and whether, in view of the present state of that city and the recommendation of the Lord Mayor, he is prepared to name the date when the proclamation of Cork under the Crimes Act will be withdrawn.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to this Question is in the negative.

MR. TULLY: I think there must be some misapprehension. Was not Mr. William O'Brien there at the head of 10,000 men?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The Question has been answered, and the hon. Member must not proceed to argue.

MR. TULLY: But we were told that Mr. O'Brien was there at the head of 10,000 men.

Westport Rural District Council and the Land Question.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received from the Westport Rural District Council a report setting forth a solution of the Land Question on the lines of compulsory purchase, and an equitable division of the waste grazing lands, and whether he can state if he is prepared to give effect to the recommendations in this report.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have nothing to add to my repeated repudiations of compulsory purchase and impracticable projects for taking away the property of large farmers.

MR. TULLY: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake to introduce into his Land Bill a Clause dealing with waste grazing lands?

[No answer was returned.]

Suir Bridge Tolls.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the loss occasioned to the city of Waterford by the system of charging tolls on passengers and goods crossing the bridge over the Suir; and whether he intends to promote legislation in this session to remedy this state of matters.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The matter is engaging attention. On the representation of the Corporation of Waterford, inquiry has been directed under 4 and 5 Will. IV., c. 61.

Mr. TULLY: Will the Government grant any relief in this case?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I do not imagine that that question arises at all. It is a question of two counties combining to have a bridge across the river.

Crime in Cavan and Leitrim.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the presentation of white gloves to the County Court Judge in Cavan and Leitrim, he is prepared to withdraw the Crimes Act proclamations in these counties.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

Irish Poor Law Audits.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Poor Law Association of Ireland have sent resolutions to the Local Government Board asking to have inspectors and auditors appointed in future from members of the Poor Law Service; and whether the request contained in these resolutions has been complied with.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Such resolutions have been passed. In filling vacancies on its staff, the Board proceeds on the principle of selecting the persons whom it considers best qualified for these positions.

Mr. TULLY: Is the Poor Law Service to be the only service in which promotions are not given to the officials?

[No answer was returned.]

Local Government (Ireland) Bill.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if he will proceed forthwith with the Local Government (Ireland) Bill, having regard to the wishes of Irish ratepayers on the subject.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I must refer the hon. Member to a recent reply of the Prime Minister.†

Mr. TULLY: The hon. Gentleman can get the Bill through now in ten minutes. It means a saving of £25,000 a year to the taxpayers.

Unlawful Assemblies in Belfast.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many prosecutions for unlawful assembly have taken place during the last two years under The Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, in the city of Belfast.

Mr. WYNDHAM: It has not been found necessary to institute proceedings under this provision of the Act in Belfast. Persons who break the law there are made amenable under the ordinary law, and receive exemplary punishment.

Mr. TULLY: Are not the assemblies in Belfast, every Sunday, just as unlawful as the one for which I was sent to gaol?

[No answer was returned.]

Martello Tower at Brighton Vale.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state how much was realised by the sale of the martello tower at Brighton Vale, in the Blackrock district; and how much of the proceeds has been refunded to the Urban Council.

Lord STANLEY: The reply to the first part of the Question is £300; the reply to the second part is, None.

Mr. TULLY: Is the noble Lord prepared to sell as a job lot the rest of the fortifications?

Brussels Sugar Convention.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, as Article XII. of the Brussels Convention provides that the fulfilment of the convention is subordinated to the completion of the formalities and requirements established by the constitutional laws of each of the contracting parties, and Article IV. imposes the countervailing duties, and that provision is made for the convention not being completed by one of the contracting parties before February, 1903, he will consider the desirability of introducing any Bill that may be necessary in connection with this matter before the convention is ratified.

---

† See page 828.

The PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): As the hon. Gentleman is no doubt aware, the sanction of Parliament is not required for the ratification of this Treaty. I should have preferred to bring in legislation to give effect to it in the course of the present session, but that is quite out of the question, and, therefore, legislation must be deferred to a more convenient season.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): Am I right in understanding that the right hon. Gentleman does not intend either to introduce any legislation or to submit any resolution which would give the House an opportunity of expressing its opinion on this matter?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think I have clearly said that we do propose to introduce a resolution.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will it be a financial resolution?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It will not be a financial resolution in the sense of being required to be brought in in Committee of the House.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. BRYCE: I should like to ask for information as to the business to be taken this week, and this day week after the Indian Budget. I am inclined to assume that the Indian Budget will occupy the whole of the evening as well as the morning sitting, but some uncertainty seems to exist on the subject.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I rather agree with the anticipation of the right hon. Gentleman that the Indian Budget will occupy the morning sitting and possibly a good part, at all events, of the evening sitting. However that may be, I shall put down either the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill or the Militia and Yeomanry Bill as the second Order. In other words, I should not propose to take the Education Bill on Monday. During this week, I propose, as at present advised—it may be subject to alterations—to take the Education Bill every afternoon. Some of the evening sittings, I anticipate, will be occupied with business connected with the Transvaal Vote.

MR. BRYCE: Which will be the first evening given to that subject?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who has charge of this Vote, proposes to move tomorrow that the Vote be taken on Wednesday.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): It will be a Motion, I presume, "that Mr. Speaker leave the Chair."

MR. LOUGH: Will Papers be distributed before the Transvaal Vote is taken?

*MR. RITCHIE: Tomorrow it is proposed to move that on the following day the House resolve itself into Committee; and the Paper itself will be distributed tomorrow.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Will the Motion be made at two o'clock?

*MR. RITCHIE: No, at nine o'clock.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: When that Motion is made, I shall oppose it. May I ask whether there is to be any demand for money on the part of the Crown, through the medium of a Message or Speech? That is invariably the first step in granting Supply in this House.

*MR. RITCHIE: I think my hon. friend had better wait till tomorrow.

Mr. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I suppose the Local Authorities (Bills, in Parliament) Bill will not be taken this week. It is a very contentious measure.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Does the right hon. Gentleman propose to take it this session?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid we are not yet near the end of the session.

Mr. TULLY: When will the right hon. Gentleman take the Irish Local Government Bill? It means a relief of £25,000 a year to the rates.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot say at present.

Mr. TULLY: Will you take it tonight, seeing that you can get it through in ten minutes?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir, I will not.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Ordered, That the several Accounts and Papers which have been presented to the House in this Session of Parliament relating to the Revenues of India be referred to the consideration of a Committee of the whole House.—(*Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*)

Resolved, That this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into the said Committee.—(*Secretary Lord George Hamilton.*)

OSBORNE ESTATE BILL.

Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, by His Majesty's Command, informed the House that His Majesty placed his interests in the Osborne Estate at the disposal of Parliament.

Bill, "to make provision with respect to the disposition and management of His Majesty's Osborne Estate, in the Isle of Wight," presented by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, under Standing Order No. 31; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 301.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 9:—

(2.40.) Mr. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) moved that the consideration of the Clause should be postponed. He said his reason for doing so was very simple. The Clause deals with the provision of new schools. As the Bill originally stood, finance was dealt with in a sub-Section of Clause 8; but it had now been postponed. Before they considered the provision of new schools they ought to know what financial arrangements the Government proposed to make to assist the local authority in providing the schools, and consequently Clause 9, he thought, ought to be postponed until the question of financial arrangements had been considered. Moreover, the Committee had not yet on the Paper the alterations in Clause 9, which, it was obvious from the Prime Minister's reference at Manchester to the power which Nonconformists would have of building schools out of public funds, would be required. He was sorry to have again to quote that speech, but the right hon. Gentleman, in that part of it dealing with the large number of advantages which Nonconformists were going to derive from the Bill, asked if they (the Nonconformists) would not hail with acclamation a Bill which enabled them, for the first time in our history, to build, out of public funds, schools according to their own views or even their own prejudices. But according to the Bill, as it stood, the cost of the buildings was to be provided by the Nonconformist bodies themselves. Did the First Lord intend to adhere to the policy which he thus set out at Manchester? It was quite clear that the Clause, as it stood, did not carry out that policy, and that something very different must be substituted for it. Hence he suggested the postponement of the consideration of the Clause, to enable the Government to produce their Amendments. He was aware that the right hon. Gentleman had put down an Amendment to Clause

13 which would enable the local authority o find a certain portion of the funds required for building new voluntary schools, but it was absurd to say that a denomination should have the power to set up a denominational school, until the financial intentions of the Government were fully before them.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Clause 9 be postponed."—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said he could not, of course, accept the proposal of the hon. Gentleman. With regard to the financial point of view, the policy of this Clause was quite irrespective of any decision that might be come to with regard to the financial Clause, which they would have to discuss later. With regard to the second point, as to the view he expressed at Manchester, he did not know whether it was his fault, but he had heard statements on that matter with which he could not agree. He had not seen that portion of the report which the hon. Member had quoted, but what he intended to express was quite clear. Take the case of a town like Preston, where the whole place was covered by voluntary schools; it was impossible to lay down a general rule and say that there should be no rate-provided schools at all. If the Nonconformists objected, for instance, to the teaching in the denominational schools, they would be wholly without a remedy, and that remedy was proposed by this Bill. He hoped the hon. Member would not press the Motion.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) thought there was a good deal to be said in favour of the postponement of the Clause. The Government proposed to give £900,000 yearly towards educational purposes in addition to the grants already made, and it was exceedingly important before Parliament parted with that money they should ensure that it should be used for the reduction of rates and to secure increased efficiency. They were now coming to, he would not say the most important Clause of the Bill, but certainly the most obnoxious part of it. If the Government wanted to pass a good Bill surely they would put the interests of education generally throughout the country before those of sects. Could they not allocate a portion of this sum for the purpose of getting rid of the miserable, squalid little schools which now covered the country districts? He would remind the Committee that when the whisky money was given, the first thing that was done in the Welsh counties, under the wise guidance of Mr. Acland, was to pool the money for the purpose of creating a building fund. It was now within the power of the Government to do more for education in certain poor districts than had been done for thirty years. Would the Government now agree to allocate part of the money to be voted under the Bill for the purposes of Clause 9, and see that it was devoted to building purposes. What was the difficulty now in rural districts? It was not that the people failed to realise that the present state of the schools was detrimental to the interests of education, but it was the fact that any attempt to provide new buildings crushed the ratepayers even more than the maintenance rate. The cost of building was prohibitive. Let the Prime Minister face this problem now, and introduce into the Clause a provision allocating a portion of the £900,000 for building purposes. Let him agree to set aside £200,000 or £300,000 with the object of building new schools in rural districts and in the poorer districts of large towns. That would do far more for the cause of education than the present Clause, which was calculated to embitter and extend the area of sectarian strife. As he had said, the whisky money in the Welsh counties enabled the creation of a building fund out of which substantial grants were made to assist in the building of new schools. He hoped the Prime Minister would not treat this as a dilatory Motion, but look on it as one which was calculated to convert a pernicious into a fairly good working Clause.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea, District), as another reason for postponing the consideration of the Clause, pointed out that they had not yet determined the constitution of the Education Committee. That was to be done by Clause 12, which was of a most extraordinary character, because the local education authority, about which they heard so much in the debates on Clause 8, was only to act in certain cases of its own motion. According to Clause 9, as he construed it, the local education authority would only be able to act through the local committee, and the Clause evidently contemplated disputes, and even litigation, between the local education authority and persons who wished a new school to be provided. Surely, then, they ought to determine the constitution of the Education Committee before deciding how the new schools were to be provided.

(2.55.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 64; Noes, 115. (Division List, No. 455.)

AYES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bell, Richard
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. M'Kenna and Mr. Trevelyan.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Col. James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Denny, Colonel
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Heaton, John Henniker
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson

Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks).
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—
Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

(3.12.) THE CHAIRMAN: The first Amendment, standing in the name of the hon. Member for West Carmarthen, seems to me to be already provided for, because the Committee has handed over to the new local authority the powers of the School Boards under Section 18 of the Act of 1870, one of which is to provide such school accommodation as is necessary. The only distinction is that between the words "adequate" and "necessary." The next Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for the Flint Boroughs is not necessary. The Amendment in the name of the hon. Member for North Camberwell seems to me to raise the same point as the Amendment of the hon. Member for West Carmarthen.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said that the Amendment he desired to move simply set out the preparatory statement in the Act of 1870, before the scheme was set forth. He thought it was highly desirable that that statement should be inserted before they proceeded to the discussion of the Clause. The greater part of Section 18 of the Act of 1870 was repealed, and what remained referred only to the provision of schools by School Boards; whereas the Bill contemplated the provision of schools by the local education authority "or any other persons." He therefore thought it desirable that the preparatory statement should be inserted.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is provided for by the third schedule of the Bill, which states—

> "(5) The following provision shall have effect in lieu of Section 5 of the Elementary Education Act, 1891."

DR. MACNAMARA said it was now proposed to repeal that part of the Act of 1870 which made it incumbent on the local authority to carry out its powers.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member will see that the way in which it is proposed will re-enact Section 5; and he can move to alter that when we get to the schedule. The Amendment in the name of the hon. Member for the Saffron Walden Division stands on the same ground; and the Amendment of the hon. Member for Rugby seems to me to be a negation of the Clause, besides being contrary to what the Committee has already passed in Clause 8.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he wished to move an Amendment to omit "where," the first word in the Clause, in order to insert "It shall be the duty of."

THE CHAIRMAN: That would not read.

MR. LOUGH said he proposed to move subsequent Amendments which would make it quite in order. He would move to omit "or any other persons," and also all the words after "provide," and to insert a "sufficient amount of public school accommodation."

THE CHAIRMAN: That is provided for in the third schedule. It is perfectly clear.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W. R., Elland) said that the governing words in the schedule were "without payment of fees," which did not refer to school accommodation at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Member does not like these words, he can propose to strike them out when the schedule is reached.

DR. MACNAMARA said the position was that they desired that new school accommodation should be provided by the local authority, whereas the scheme in the Bill proposed it should be provided by the local authority, "or any other persons." Surely, therefore, the Amendment of his hon. friend to insert "It shall be the duty of," was in order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those words are already in the Bill. By Clause 6, the Committee has incorporated Section 18 of the Act of 1870, which says that a School Board shall provide such school accommodation as is necessary.

MR. M'KENNA: In their opinion

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, in their opinion. The words are as clear as possible. If the hon. Member objects to the words "or any other persons," he can move to strike them out when they are reached.

MR. LOUGH said he attached importance to his Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: I attach importance to my ruling. The Amendment of the hon. Member for West Denbighshire is in order.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) moved to omit the words "the local education authority or any other," and to insert "any." The object of the Amendment would be perfectly clear. He was glad it had been laid down from the Chair that Clause 6 of the Bill, as amended, made it perfectly clear that the local education authority would be responsible for the provision of adequate public elementary school accommodation. The Amendment did not in any way affect any other persons taking the initiative; that would be raised by a later Amendment, but he wished to make it clear at the outset that his Amendment, taking it for granted that the local education authority would be responsible for providing adequate school accommodation, and that any other persons had the right of initiating new school accommodation, laid it down that the local education authority should be withdrawn from rivalry and competition, and be made the sole arbitrator in the case of any conflict or dispute. He did not think his Amendment was in any way out of harmony with the spirit and the tenour of the Bill, so far as it had proceeded. What was the present position? The denominational schools were to remain, for the present at all events, in our educational system; and a bargain had been arrived at by which the supporters of the denominational schools received certain advantages, certain local Government grants being given to the counties. But when they came to the question of providing new school accommodation, he thought a new issue was raised; and he did not think that it was out of harmony with the spirit of the Bill that, in that matter, the local education authority should be the supreme judge and sole arbitrator in all questions of dispute. So far as they had gone, it had been laid down that the local education authority was to have complete control of secular education; that it was to prescribe a standard of excellence in the schools; and that it was to be responsible for raising and spending the education rate. He put it to the Committee, was it unnatural, given that condition of things, that the local education authority should be the authority to decide in a case of dispute with regard to the necessity of providing further school accommodation? He proposed the Amendment on one or two main grounds. First of all, if it were accepted he thought it would avoid a great deal of friction which might arise under this Bill between the education authority on the one hand and the managers of schools and other persons who might desire to build schools on the other. Under the operation of Clause 8 as at present drafted they would have the spectacle of competition between the local education authority and private persons; there might be the ten ratepayers brought in, and finally the appeal to the High Court. Must that not be a somewhat humiliating position for any local authority constituted such as those under the Bill? The real crux of the question was, was the local education authority in these matters to be trusted or not? The hon. and learned Attorney General had stated that the desire of the Government was to trust the local education authority. The point therefore was whether the local education authorities were to be only a kind of magnified School Board, or were they to be bodies which, by reason of their responsibility, would draw to their service the most experienced elements of public life in this country. His object all along had been to strengthen the hands and heighten the responsibility of these local education authorities, and that was the object which underlay all the Amendments he had moved. In his opinion the success of the Bill when passed would largely depend upon the success that would be attained in bringing good men to the service of the local education authorities. If these authorities were to be the representation of the best judgment, the best experience of the life of the counties, then they must be given such powers as would make it impossible for them to be led into competition with bands of private individuals who desired to build schools. He moved the Amendment with the sole object of making it clear, whatever the form of the Clause might eventually be, that it would not be possible for such authorities as this to be brought into rivalry with private individuals. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—-

"In page 3, line 36, to leave out the words, 'the local education authority or any other,' and insert the word 'any.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the local education authority' stand part of the Clause."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said he cordially agreed with the desire the hon. Member had expressed that the services of the best men should be available for these local education authorities, but he did not think there was anything in the Clause as it stood which would conflict with the attainment of that object. The Clause dealt with the provision of new schools, and it was quite obvious that it must depend on the circumstances of the locality what class of schools should be provided. It might be that in some districts what was now called a board school would be built, and in others what was now termed a voluntary school. What the hon. Gentleman proposed was to do away with all check in the provision of new board schools, and leave it simply at the option of the local authority to provide new board schools, whatever the effect might be upon the voluntary schools of the district. He could not agree, and hoped the Committee would not agree, with the object set before it. As a matter of fact, this Amendment would not carry out the object of the hon. Member, because the "persons" would include the local authority. So that even if the Amendment were passed it would be futile.

DR. MACNAMARA, upon a point of order, asked whether, if this Amendment were disposed of, it would invalidate an Amendment on the next page to strike out "All other persons."

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think it would strike out that Amendment.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said he understood the object of the Amendment was to prevent friction between the local education authority and the managers. His hon. friend pleaded that if the local authority, the ruling authority of the district, thought fit to make provision, it should not be affected by the recommendations that were laid down in Clause 9. He thought the Government might meet the Committee to that extent, because so far as existing voluntary schools were concerned, they were placed in a stronger and more unassailable position than they were be-fore. They pleaded for a little more liberty for the extension of the public system of elementary schools. It was not a Nonconformist system. Many of the teachers of the School Boards were Churchmen. They pleaded for a system like that in vogue in Scotland, and he hoped the Government would consider the advisability of meeting them a little in that way, and of giving more freedom to the local education authorities in the provision of new public elementary schools.

(3.28.) Question proposed.

Committee divided:—Ayes, 145 Noes, 87. (Division List, No 456.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert

Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell,RtHnJ.A.(Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb,SirJohnCharlesReady
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald,SirRobts.Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edwd. Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore,Hon.S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hain, Edward
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt.Hon.RobertWm.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hozier,Hon.JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo.T.(Denbigh
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,RtHn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray,RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Myers, William Henry
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis Robert
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Ridley,Hn. M.W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rothschild,Hon.LionelWalter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester).
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,RtHn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby,Sir CharlesG.E.(Notts,
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Williams,RtHnJPowell-(Birm
Wilson-Todd,Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor,HenryWilson
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn. HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred, (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Evans,SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Grey,Rt.Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne,Rt.Hon.Charles Seale-
Hayter,Rt.Hon.Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill,Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones,DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch,SirJohnGeorgeSmyth
Lambert, George
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M‘Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mellor,Rt.Hon. John William
Middlemore,JohnThrogmort'n
Morgan,J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley,Rt.Hn.John (Montrose
Newnes, Sir George
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer,SirCharlesM.(Durham
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer,RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)

Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Hudd'rsf'd
Yoxall, Henry James

Tellers for the Noes—
Mr. Herbert Roberts and
Mr. Edwards.

(3.38.) Mr. TREVELYAN, in moving the omission of the words "or any other persons,'" said the Amendment was one of the most important that could be moved inasmuch as its object, with certain consequential Amendments, was to secure that all new schools provided out of public funds under the Act would be built by the public authority. The scheme of the Government was nominally to give equal facilities to different sects to provide new schools. The various Churches were to be permitted under certain circumstances, if they could find the funds, to build schools in different districts. He wished to dwell upon one minor evil of that proposal. The Church of England was already complaining that she would not be able to find the money for the repairs to her existing schools as required by the Bill. Eight hundred voluntary schools had not a single penny of subscriptions, while 700 more had subscriptions only to the amount of 1s. per child, and yet upon the shoulders of these schools was to be imposed for all time the duty of providing for repairs. Surely it was a very dangerous thing, in addition to this obligation, to permit the Church to build schools in districts where she did not now possess them. The only way in which the Church could provide for repairs at present was by calling in aid from other districts, so that the result of this proposal of the Bill would be that, in order to build new schools—which would be one of her main objects—the Church would draw upon those very resources which ought to be tapped for the purpose of repairs for existing schools. That, however, was a minor evil. The chief consideration was that, if the Clause were passed in its present form, it would instantly become the ambition of the clergymen of every religious community to find funds to build schools wherever they could get the permission of the Board of Education to do so, and in every little village there would be a competition between the different sects. It had already been stated that if the Church of England built schools under this Clause the Wesleyans might find it necessary to compete with them, and possibly would build several hundred schools. The prospect opened up by that statement was anti-National and odious. Children ought not to be separated into little lots of different sects brought up in schools in which they were taught to dislike the children in other schools——

Lord HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): Can the hon. Member give an instance of a school in which the children are taught to dislike the children in another school?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have a case which I will give by-and-bye.

Mr. TREVELYAN contended that the mere fact of the children being segregated into different sets according to their religion was practically bound to foster such a feeling. In an earlier debate he cited the case of a village in which the Nonconformists and the Church clergyman quarrelled over the appointment of a teacher, with the result that the Nonconformists set up a separate school of their own. Up to that time the village had been perfectly united so far as the goodwill of the people was concerned and no ill-feeling had existed between the different religious sects; but the very fact of two schools having been established—as would be done in dozens of villages under this Clause—had set up a denominational rivalry, and the village was torn from top to bottom with religious differences. That was bound to happen. If they gave this permission it would involve building, in numbers of parishes, schools by different denominations. Further, they objected because, as the law stood under the administrative conditions under which it must work, there was no doubt that special advantages were given to the sectarian schools as against schools provided by the public. In the first place, it would be to the advantage of the local authority to allow the different sects to build schools in preference to themselves because they would not then have to provide them out of the rates. That was a direct bribe to erecting sectarian schools in preference to erecting schools by the public. Further, the Education Department, by the very words of the Bill in the 10th Clause, would be bound rather to prefer sectarian schools to schools erected by the public authority, because one of the things which the Board of Education had to take into consideration was the economy of the rates, and if it could get schools built by a religious community instead of out of the public purse that would be economy of the rates, and if there was a question of bias in the mind of the Education Department it would clearly be in favour of the sectarian schools. For these reasons it appeared to him that not only were they to have a system perpetuated under which more and more sectarian schools would spring up all over the country, but they were actually to have an advantage given to the building of sectarian schools as against schools built by the public. He thought this was an altogether wrong system. They believed in a national system of education under which the schools were in the hands of the public, and they did not look forward to having England breaking out into a sort of rash of sectarian schools which the denominationalists could scratch until the whole system was in a state of irritation. They saw in this part of the Bill another encouragement to the setting up of sectarian schools, and this was protested against prior to 1870, when it was alleged that special facilities were being given for the building of sectarian schools. One of those who denounced that policy vigorously at that time was the Colonial Secretary, who protested against the giving of public grants for the building of these schools. The Government were not now proposing public grants but a far more insidious thing, for they were asking denominationalists to subscribe money for the building of sectarian schools and promising to maintain them ever afterwards out of the public funds. He hoped the House would seriously consider this question before consenting to an increase of this dual system.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 36, to leave out the words, 'or any other persons.'"—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the hon. Gentleman opposite was not far wrong when he said that the issue raised by this Amendment was a clear and important one, indeed, it cuts very deep into the fundamental question underlying the scheme on which the system of education is carried on, and probably we shall have to go into the Division Lobby because we entertain a different view as to the principle upon which religious teaching should be carried out in our elementary schools. The hon. Gentleman's proposal is quite simple. It is that even if voluntary schools are to be tolerated where they exist now new voluntary schools are not to be tolerated in the future, and that every provision for future education must be made out of the rates by the local authority, and must, of course, be subject to those limitations which affect the schools. In other words, the hon. Gentleman lays it down as a fundamental principle that, at all events, in all cases of future provision we should only provide them under the limitation of the Cowper-Temple Clause. This is a significant speech to listen to, after the statement made by a colleague of the hon. Member from Wales on the last Amendment, seeing that he desired to see the Scotch system adopted. The view taken now by the hon. Member is precisely the opposite, for he wishes to see the English School Board system, which is profoundly contrasted with the Scotch system in this respect, made the universal system, so far as the provision of new schools is concerned. I think the hon. Member will admit that that accurately represents what he proposes. So strong was the hon. Member upon this point that he thought it fit and proper to describe any system which tempered the English form of rate-provided schools with an admixture of voluntary schools as anti-national and odious. I absolutely differ from the hon. Member, for reasons which I believe very fundamental, and which I will state in a very few words. I have to repeat here words which I have uttered before on the platform and elsewhere, and say that, in my view, it is a tolerable and even a good system to say what we do in Scotland, that the public shall provide elementary schools for the community, but in providing those schools they are not to be hampered by any restrictions as to the religious teaching in those schools, which should be left to their own discretion and to their judgment to see that the teaching shall be suitable to the children of the district.

DR. MACNAMARA: Yes, give us that.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The English system of providing schools is that, where there is a deficiency not to be met in any other way it shall be met by rate-provided schools, but that in those schools the education authority for the district whether School Boards, as it is now, or County or Borough Councils, as under this Bill, are to be limited in their discretion as to the education to be provided, and however much the parents of those children, or large sections of them, desire a particular kind of religious education, they are not to have it unless it is in conformity with the Cowper-Temple Clause. I hold that system as an absolutely intolerable one, unless you temper it with the voluntary schools, and holding that view as regards the whole scheme of English education, it is as clearly necessary to provide scope and room for the voluntary school education of the future as it is to preserve the voluntary schools already erected for the purpose of meeting this peculiar need. That, Sir, is the whole case in a nutshell. If I am to be told that the view of hon. Gentlemen opposite is that the Cowper-Temple Clause to which, I understand, they attach such great importance, is to be abandoned as far as all rate-provided schools are concerned, I admit that the force of my contention would be largely in the air. Is that the view we are to have pressed upon us, and is that what would be given by the general body of hon. Gentlemen opposite without any undue delay or prolonged discussion?

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick): You must give us the Scotch system as a whole. I understand the right hon. Gentleman is offering us only a morsel of the Scotch system.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We are now providing that schools will have to be provided in future for the growing needs of the child population. If all schools to be provided out of the rates are to be limited by the Cowper-Temple Clause, then you must give room in this future provision for the voluntary schools; but if you say that this future provision is to be made out of the rates, and not under the limitation of the Cowper-Temple Clause, then I admit that the argument I have addressed to the House loses a great deal of its force. I do not believe that that is the view of the great body of Nonconformist opinion in this country or of hon. Gentlemen opposite. I have always understood that they attach something almost in the nature of superstitious veneration to the Cowper-Temple Clause, that they had invented something in the nature of a new orthodoxy under the shadow of that Clause, and that they regarded every form of religion outside it as anti-national and odious and verging upon superstition. If I am assured on authoritative grounds that the whole Nonconformist body have turned right round in the twinkling of a moment and abandoned the Cowper-Temple Clause altogether as regards rate-provided schools, I shall be very glad to consider the development of a situation which, to me, is so new and so unexpected.

(4.0.) MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) thought there were many other objections to this Clause, and many other arguments in favour of this Amendment, which would be sufficient to condemn the Clause, without bringing in the religious question at all. He must say one word about the way the Prime Minister brought in the case of Scotland. It seemed to him that the right hon. Gentleman was playing fast and loose in this matter. He was always asking, "Will you have the Scotch system?" and when they asked, "Will you give the Scotch system?" he immediately escaped. There were good and sufficient reasons why the Scotch system was not given. He was not entitled to say what the Nonconformists in England, or the English laity collectively, as against the clerical body, thought of it. He was not prepared to say whether the laity generally, or the Nonconformist section of them, would accept the Scotch system instead of the Cowper-Temple Clause, but he thought he might safely say that they would not accept the abolition of the Cowper-Temple Clause except upon the condition that the Scotch system was brought in in its entirety; that was to say, that everywhere, in town and country, it should be within the reach of every child, and that there should be a popularly elected body, like the School Board, to administer the schools of the country. He was quite prepared, for his own part, to believe that if that was the case the religious difficulty would come to an end, because that difficulty was a plant which did not thrive in the atmosphere of popularity. The open sun and air of a popularly elected body would put an end to those troubles, quarrels, jealousies, suspicions and animosities which thrive under a sectarian system. The Scotch Members would be able to confirm what he said when he stated that there were practically no difficulties, quarrels, and troubles arising under their system in Scotland. The reason was that it was all public. The School Boards were responsible to the electorate, and if there was any attempt to abuse the power given to them to give instruction according to what was called "use and wont," that would be immediately rectified by the asking of questions of the elected members of the School Boards, and all those troubles and difficulties would disappear. The right hon. Gentleman disliked the Cowper-Temple Clause. It was disliked because it corresponded to the facts of the case, namely, that ninety-nine out of every 100 English parents of the laity desired that their children should read the Bible and receive religious instruction based on the Bible, and that they desired nothing more. [An Hon. MEMBER: "How do you propose to prove that?"] Of course it was one of those assertions that might be made on one side or the other. He had never seen a particle of evidence produced that English parents desired anything more. There had been every opportunity, occasion and motive during the last six months to produce that evidence, but it had not been forthcoming. He would give his hon. friend another illustration. At the present moment there were more than a million Anglican children in board schools. Most of these children had within their reach sectarian schools, where they could obtain definite and distinct dogmatic instruction if they wanted it, but they preferred board schools. He supposed that everyone in this House who had taken the trouble to inquire could find places within his own knowledge, in which a very large proportion of the children in board schools and unsectarian schools were the children of Anglican parents. He remembered a case of a very large unsectarian school where one-third of the children were of Church of England parents, and where there were large numbers of voluntary schools within very short reach of the homes of these parents. He had not the slightest doubt that he was within the mark in saying that ninety-nine out of every 100 English lay parents preferred, or, at any rate, were well satisfied, that their children should receive religious undogmatic instruction under the Cowper-Temple Clause. The same thing was put by the Secretary to the Board of Education when he said, on Friday last, that English parents who had not the Scotch keen eye for differences in doctrine were willing to take the theology as they found it. He thought the English parents were right. Why? Because, like sensible people, it was Bible instruction they wanted for their children in elementary schools.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): Are not the Scotch parents who desire the Shorter Catechism sensible people?

MR. BRYCE: Scotch parents care very little whether it is taught or not. He could give instances from his own city where it was not taught at all in schools, and no complaint was made. In most cases in Scotland the old habit of teaching was followed, but no trouble ever arose. In many cases where it was not taught, compared with cases where it was taught, equal satisfaction and peace prevailed. That went to confirm what he had stated, that everything worked well where there was a popular elective system. He passed from the religious aspect of the subject, into which he had only been led by the remarks which fell from the right hon. Gentleman. He could not let the remarks about the Cowper-Temple Clause pass without saying that the reason why that was followed was because it corresponded to the facts of the case. It gave the children what the parents wanted, and what the children were able to profit by. If they wanted dogmatic instruction superseded at a later stage by all means let that be done. They were dealing here with children under fourteen years of age. There were three grounds which he thought were sufficient to recommend the Amendment to the House. The first was that the Clause as it stood was in the last degree disparaging and injurious to the local education authority. They were calling a new local education authority into being. They were purposing to give it great and wide powers. They were endeavouring to induce persons of influence, importance, and public spirit, to enter its service. In the last Clause the Committee inflicted great indignity upon them by subjecting them to an appeal to the Board of Education on a large number of questions in which they differed from the managers. They were now carrying that further, because they were asked by this Clause to say that the local authority should have no privilege, advantage, or preference in proposing to provide schools over a number of people in the locality who might desire to do it. They could not pay a worse compliment to the local authority than by not giving them the right of being the persons to provide the schools. His second objection to the scheme of the Clause was that it was proposed to multiply small schools, and to aggravate one of the greatest evils of the existing system. On this side of the House they had not ceased since the Bill was introduced to dwell upon the inconvenience in any national system of education of having two sets of schools over a whole town, standing in different relations to the local authority, and which, because kept up independently of each other, must tend to weaken one another. In how many parts of the country had they not at this moment two or three schools within a radius of two miles, each of which was weak and imperfectly staffed, each of which had deficient buildings, and where what was wanted was consolidation? One reason why the board schools in the town had been so much more efficient than the schools in the country was that they could be equipped on a larger scale. If by this Clause they allowed a certain number to say that there was a necessity to provide a new school for sectarian purposes—instead of enlarging the existing school, and in that way strengthening it, giving it better financial support, and a better staff—they perpetuated the existing evil. He appealed to hon. Members, whatever their opinion on the religious question, and whatever they might think of the value of giving sectarian dogmatic instruction, to remember at any rate that on the educational side the case against this scheme was very strong. They wanted to bring the schools together rather than to keep them apart. They wanted to organise them on a comprehensive plan. They wanted each in an area to subserve a common purpose, but it was proposed to drive them farther from that great aim by the multiplication of small schools. Really he could not convey sufficiently to the Committee his sense of the inefficiency, waste, and needless expense which would be incurred if they followed out this plan. He was bound to say that he thought this proposal threw a very sinister light on the whole purpose and motive of the Bill. They had been constantly told that the great reason for the Bill was that the denominations were already in possession of the schools and that they could not ask the ratepayers to incur the great expense of building a large number of new schools, and that they could not take the existing schools without compensation, which would be a ruinous expense to impose on the rates. That was put forward as the main justification of the Bill. But surely that justification entirely failed when they came to this Clause, because here it was proposed to do the thing afresh and make it more difficult than ever by creating new vested interests, and raising up further obligations. Therefore, when he looked at this Clause he thought he saw the true purpose, motive, and origin of the Bill. He thought the argument about vested interests was a fictitious one put forward to conceal the motive behind, which was to strengthen the hold of sectarianism on the country. By this Clause the Government were multiplying vested interests, and multiplying all those difficulties which were to come up in the future. It was not the way to get rid of them. For his part he did not think this system could last. If the right hon. Gentleman and those who agree with him succeed in getting rid of the Cowper-Temple Clause he believed they would be doing the worst possible service to the religious education of the people. He believed the Cowper-Temple Clause was the sheet-anchor of religious education in the schools in this country. He was just as much attached as the right hon. Gentleman or the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich to the desirability and importance of retaining a religious atmosphere in the schools, but he was sure that if this contest on the religious difficulty was kept alive, and if they were to have the same strife for the next thirty years as they had had for the past thirty years the issue would be the complete secularisation of the schools. In the United States and in the British Colonies that was the solution of the problem at which they had arrived. The Cowper-Temple Clause afforded a common basis for religious education in the board schools—a common basis in this sense: that under it the common truths of Christianity were imparted to the children. And archbishops and bishops had declared that the religious education given in the board schools had been of the utmost possible value and afforded the best possible foundation for the Christian life.

Lord HUGH CECIL was understood to dissent.

Mr. BRYCE said he could only maintain that the testimony seemed to him conclusive, because if these eminent prelates had shared the opinion of the noble Lord they could not have spoken as they did about the religious teaching in the board schools. He repeated that the best chance of preserving a religious atmosphere in our schools was the preservation of the Cowper-Temple Clause, and that if it fell it would be followed by the secularisation of the schools altogether. He would set forth in a few words his objections to the Clause and his reasons for supporting the Amendment. It was a disparagement of the local authorities by placing them on a level with private persons, and by denying them the function of meeting the growing necessities of public education in the localities, the wants and feelings of which they understood. It was a perpetuation of sectarian strife, and an aggravation of the tendency that existed to divide children into groups upon no other ground than the religious opinions of their parents—and he believed that in that respect it was an injury to the minds of the parents themselves. And, lastly, it was educationally objectionable because it would put a national system of education further out of sight, for it would multiply vested interests and involve unnecessary expense, while it would waste the efforts of men zealous for educational reform in keeping up the number of small weak schools instead of devoting their best energies to concentration.

(4.25.) **Sir JOHN GORST** (Cambridge University) said he could assure the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen that the profound religious peace and excellent religious instruction in the schools were not due in any way to the Cowper-Temple Clause. That was not operative in the schools; it was a dead-letter. What did secure religious peace and excellent religious instruction was the common sense exercised by the teachers and managers notwithstanding the interference of Parliament to give to the children in the schools under their authority that sort of religious instruction which the parents of the children desired. He entirely agreed with the statement made the other day by the First Lord that provisions such as those in this Clause are absolutely unnecessary. The religious difficulty would disappear from Parliament and the platform, as it had done from the schools, if the House would consent to trust the new education authority with the power and the duty to make dispositions that all the children in the country were given the religious instruction desired by their parents.

MR. BRYCE said he did not really differ from the right hon. Gentleman; but he had never heard that offer made.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked what the right hon. Gentleman meant by saying that the Cowper-Temple Clause was the sheet-anchor of religious instruction in the schools?

MR. BRYCE said that his contention was that the Cowper-Temple Clause was the sheet-anchor of religious instruction in the board schools as things stood at present.

SIR JOHN GORST said that the right hon. Gentleman had maintained that this Clause was a dark conspiracy on the part of the Government to promote sectarian interests. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would be surprised to know that the procedure which took place at the present time in many parts of the country was in exact accordance with the provisions of this Clause which had filled the mind of the right hon. Gentleman who had moved the Amendment with such gloomy views. It was generally supposed that the School Board had the proper right to provide additional accommodation and to decide at what cost the alterations or additions were to be made. There was the conspicuous case, some years ago, of the Barry Docks, where the population had rapidly increased on account of the docks, and a very large portion of that population was Roman Catholic. The School Board of Barry Docks, which was an excellent body and had done its work supremely well, in the exercise of its right to supply all the schools which were under the sheet-anchor of religious instruction, were not able to make any provision whatever for the Roman Catholic population. That did not, however, prevent the Roman Catholics from building a school of their own, but they had to provide the whole cost of the school from their own contributions and subscriptions. By the Act of 1870, the Board of Education determined, when there was a deficiency of accommodation, how that deficiency should most advantageously be supplied, and from that time the system had gone on without any friction. It must be remembered that England and Wales were now covered with schools, and the necessity for new schools only arose from the natural increase of population in the large centres of population and from the shifting of population from the centres of the town to the suburbs. It might be more convenient in such cases to extend the existing accommodation by enlarging the school than to build a new school altogether, and very seldom had the action of the Board of Education caused any friction with the local education authority. It was an experiment which worked without any friction whatever, and which certainly was not open to the strong denunciations which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen and the hon. Member who moved the Amendment thought fit to utter. One point in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite deserved the attention of the Committee. Nothing could be more mischievous than the multiplication of small schools, but the operation of this system did not create small board schools, and if the Board of Education was as vigilant in the future as it had been in the past the right hon. Gentleman might dismiss from his mind the idea that this system would ever lead to the multiplication of small board schools. He could not see how it would be possible to do what was eminently desirable—consolidate the number of small schools—but if this Bill did not amend the law in that respect, it at all events would make it no worse. The new schools which would be created by this Clause would never in any case add to the number of small schools at present existing. Only in those very rare cases where denominational bodies were competing for the erection of a school would such schools be erected, and in those cases such schools would not add to the multiplication of small schools.

DR. MACNAMARA said the hon. Member who proposed the Amendment desired to set up the clear issue that the provision of school places should be national and not sectional. He argued that the Act of 1870 took many steps in that direction, but it had three very serious shortcomings. It did not create the authority necessary for this purpose, and when it did create the authority the area was very small. What the Act of 1870 ought to have said was—"We will give generously and handsomely to all existing voluntary school places, but from this time forward every new school place provided shall be provided by the public authority only." What the Act of 1870 did say, and the right hon. Gentleman below the gangway seemed to think that this Bill would leave things where they were, was—"There shall be a school place suitable and efficient for every child." That Clause was repealed under this Bill, so that this Bill did not leave things where they were.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that had been dealt with by a Government Amendment.

DR. MACNAMARA said the Amendment was not sufficient.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the Amendment should be made sufficient.

SIR JOHN GORST said that it had been stated since this Bill had been brought in, over and over again, that there was a mistake made in the repeal section, that that mistake would be set right, and that the duty of providing school places for every child would be thrown on the local authority.

DR. MACNAMARA said he was very glad to hear the statement of the First Lord of the Treasury that if the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment did not cover it it should be made to cover it. He pointed out that the Act of 1870 further said that if volunteers wished to make provision they should be allowed to do so, but that if they did not make provision within a specified time a public authority should be called into being which should do so, and, further, that if the public authority did not carry out this duty the authority should be declared in default and that a new authority should be elected and the locality charged with the expense. That was also to be repealed. Therefore, on the face of it, it was inaccurate to say that this Bill left the matter where it was. The substantial difference was this: both before and after the Barry School Board incident the position was that the local authority and other persons were on equal terms with regard to the administration of schools under the Act of 1870. In this case they were not on equal terms. The preference under the scheme contained in Clauses 9, 10, 11, was given to the voluntary schools. Why could not they adopt the Scotch system as it stood with regard to this matter? Lord Young's Act of 1872 laid down definitely that if there was a deficiency of school places in a particular district the local authority should provide them. Why could not that be adopted? Why should it not be a public duty? The scheme was set out in great detail in the Act, and the remarkable thing was that, in Clause 28, if the School Board on making its provision for school places did not go the length which the Scotch Board of Education thought it ought, the Board of Education could propose a larger scheme. That shewed the very wide difference between the systems.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked whether the hon. Gentleman meant the Scottish system in its true and full sense. Did he propose to throw upon the public education authority provided in this Bill the duty of providing new accommodation, and that they should not be subject to anything in the nature of the Cowper-Temple Clause?

DR. MACNAMARA said if the scheme was that nobody had a right to meet the deficiency but the public authority, that system would satisfy him.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was essential to know, in order to understand the hon. Gentleman's argument, when a new school was provided by the local authority was it to be under the Cowper-Temple Clause or not?

DR. MACNAMARA said he had several times expressed the opinion that the Cowper-Temple Clause should be modified. Let them have popular control, and the Cowper-Temple Clause, which was more or less a hedge which the Nonconformists had set up against the Church, might be swept away. As an instance of the great delay which would arise by allowing provision for new schools to be made by persons other than the local authority, he would instance a case that took place at Streatham—a case which, in his opinion, might be multiplied over and over again. Religious bodies in their zeal desired to stake out a claim which they were unable to work thoroughly—to cover areas which they had no power to cover. In March, 1895, the School Board for London, after many years, obtained sanction to provide school places at Streatham, and early in 1896 the School Board Committee came to the House for powers. In June, 1896, a deputation from the managers of the St. Leonard's school at Streatham waited upon the School Board Committee and asked them not to build a school, as they were themselves prepared to build it. The School Board consented to wait till October, 1896, and undertook if this particular body had begun to build the school to withdraw all their sanctions. October, 1896, came and the school was not begun. These people, with all their zeal for missionary work, were unable to find the money. By Christmas, 1896, nothing had been done. The School Board then consented to wait until October, 1897, to see if these persons could build the school, and finally in 1898, after three years delay, the school had to be built by the School Board. Since 1870 the denominational system had doubled the accommodation for children in schools, but for the reason he had given they had not done their work thoroughly—they had not properly cultivated the area marked out. Under the Act of 1870 the voluntary subscribers had doubled their contributions, but instead of those contributions being, as they were in 1870, half the cost of the children educated, they were now only one-seventh. Clause 5 of the Act of 1870 was now to be repealed, also Clause 18, and in their place they were to have Clause 9 of this Bill. In his opinion the provision of new schools by other than the local authority was a bad and vicious system; it should be a national obligation. The religious question could be arranged, and should not be mixed up with the provision of new schools. It was preposterous that a public authority should have to wait for provision of public schools until they found that nobody else desired to provide them. No limit of time was fixed within which those estimable people were to discharge the obligations they entered into, and he repeated the question he had so often asked during these debates—Where did the educational interests of the children come in? He invited attention to an extremely able article which appeared in *The Times* last April, in which the writer, who appeared to be intimately acquainted with the whole administrative system, showed that the provisions in Clauses 8, 9, and 10 struck deep at the roots of efficiency, and appeared to be drafted to give volunteers the first chance of providing accommodation, in order that control of religious instruction might be retained by them. He strongly objected to reliance on private agency before the public authority could act.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket) said the Bill did not provide that.

DR. MACNAMARA read Clauses 9 and 10 as containing direct incentives to the authority to favour the voluntary proposals out of regard to economy of rates. It was essential that from that day forth the provision of school places should not be left to volunteers, and that all new places should be a public charge, provided for out of public funds.

(5.0.) MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) said it had constantly been stated that one of the great hardships connected with education, especially in villages, was the practical impossibility of Nonconformists having a school such as they desired in their religious interest. This Clause enabled such schools to be established, thus doing away with that grievance, and he was therefore greatly surprised that the Opposition should object to the proposal. Surely it was only reasonable, if there was a *bonâ fide* desire in a particular place for a Church of England, Roman Catholic, or other school, that the persons desiring it should be allowed to provide it if they were prepared to pay the expenses themselves. The position taken up by the hon. Member for North Camberwell, that every new school-place should be provided by the local authority, would mean in practice that if a few more places were required in any district a new school would have to be built, because it would be impossible to expand or increase the size of the existing voluntary schools. That, he thought, would be a most unreasonable restriction. The Clause carried out the avowed desire of the Government to provide as fairly as possible for all denominations, and, bearing in mind the extensive and violent attacks which had been made with reference to the single school parishes, the Government in this proposition were entitled to expect the support rather than the opposition of the other side.

Mr. ROBSON (South Shields) asked where was the necessity for this Clause if, as stated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, the substance of the scheme proposed thereby had already been in operation for six years, and was therefore in conformity with the existing law.

Sir JOHN GORST: I said in practice.

Mr. ROBSON apprehended that the practice of the right hon. Gentleman had not been against the law. If then the Clause was unnecessary why was it in the Bill at all? By looking at the Clause one could see why it was there, and it gave a very pertinent and complete answer to the query of the hon. Member for the Stowmarket Division, viz., what was the preference given to voluntary schools by Clause 9? According to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University, the existing system enabled any denomination to appeal to the Board of Education and to get a denominational school. But it did not permit any denomination to hamper the local authority in the provision of a school which according to its judgment, checked and inspired by the popular will, was necessary, and that was what this Clause would invite and provoke a denomination to do. Wherever the local authority proposed to discharge its most elementary function and provide a new school in any district, it was to be at the mercy of ten sectarian ratepayers, who would have power to hang up a scheme for at least three months, and for some further indefinite period until the Board of Education had held an inquiry, the children in the meantime going uneducated—or, as was more likely, Clause 10 coming into operation, by which another singular preference was given to denominational schools. He spoke with some uncertainty as to the construction of that Clause, but at the end there was a provision that any school in existence containing thirty scholars should not be deemed to be unnecessary. So that in practice, without proposing to found an elementary school, a denomination might establish a school and get thirty scholars into it, with the result that it would be a school on the ground, and would have to be taken as necessary, the provision of a school by the local authority under Clause 9 being thus prevented. That observation would fall to the ground if the Clause was intended to mean schools in existence at the passing of the Act—not at the date of the inquiry under the Clause—but if his instruction was correct it was clear that the local authority would never have to provide a school at all. In the past it might have been difficult, as the right hon. Gentleman had stated, to induce members of a denomination to provide an elementary school, as they would have had to maintain it, but when they were relieved of the burden of maintenance a very different state of things would probably obtain, and there was much more likelihood of a rush of persons desirous of occupying the ground to the exclusion of the local authority. After the observations of the right hon. Gentleman, the Committee were more than ever entitled to demand a clear statement as to what, under existing circumstances, the necessity for this Clause really was. A further point was that the First Lord of the Treasury had again and again challenged the Opposition to say whether or not they desired the adoption of the Scottish system, and, if so, to what extent, and to what proportion of the schools they desired to see its principle applied. That was a very fair question, but it justified the inquiry—What did the Government think of the

Scottish system? Were they prepared to offer it? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had declared that the system really operated in England, that the Cowper-Temple Clause was a mere form, and had practically no substantial application. And why? Because the common sense of the English people had so arranged matters that they did—Cowper-Temple Clause or no Cowper-Temple Clause—succeed in giving to the children the religious teaching their parents desired. That apparently was what was done in the board schools. If that was the case, they had the Scottish system in the board schools. But if it was applicable and applied there, and the parents were satisfied with the religious teaching so given, it became yet more important to know what the Prime Minister thought of the Scottish system, because that system—which the right hon. Gentleman was understood to favour to a certain extent—entirely superseded the denominational system; it did not supersede religious teaching, but it did supersede sectarian control, and that was the position of the Liberal Party.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON (Hackney, S.) contended that for the purpose of the hon. and learned Member's argument it was immaterial which construction he placed upon Clause 10, because if a school was in existence before it became a school at all it must have been authorised under Clause 9.

MR. ROBSON said that was not so unless it was built as a proposed elementary school. If, without being proposed as such, it was simply built and peopled with thirty scholars, it became, under Clause 10, a school already in existence, and as such had to be deemed necessary by the Board of Education.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON said that such a school could not be one "actually in existence" having the necessary average attendance "as computed by the Board of Education;" it would be absolutely outside the system. In reply to the argument that delay would be caused by others than the local authority being allowed to build new schools, he would quote a case in which much delay was prevented. In Basingstoke there happened to be a school built for use as a Sunday school, but also with a view to its becoming, if necessary, an ordinary elementary day school. The Basingstoke School Board required further school accommodation, and the Church of England, to which this school belonged, immediately offered the building to the Board, by whom it was gladly accepted. If the present Amendment were accepted such an arrangement would be made impossible, and the children would have to wait a year, or perhaps two years, before the necessary accommodation could be provided.

(5.15.) MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that so far as Wales was concerned the Welsh Members would close with the Prime Minister, if he would give them the Scotch system. He did not think that the control of religious teaching should be in the hands of the County Councils, covering as they did considerable areas, but that that power should be given to parish authorities. They had heard it said that the Cowper-Temple Clause was a great safeguard for the Nonconformists. It was said to have been introduced originally in the interest of the Nonconformists, and notably it was said by the Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary that it was introduced to protect the Nonconformist minority. He was glad, however, that the Prime Minister, for the first time, made no pretext of that kind now, but if this was something to protect Nonconformists he did not think the Prime Minister should thrust upon them a blessing which they repudiated. It was perfectly clear that the Clause under debate was not introduced on behalf of the Nonconformists but simply and purely to promote a system of sectarianism which they protested against. It was only part and parcel of a system which the Bill was intended primarily to promote, namely, the sectarian system. The right hon Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University said there was no religious difficulty in the board schools.—

SIR JOHN GORST said he applied that remark to all schools. He had challenged the House many times to name a single instance where a single Nonconformist child was excluded from the teaching profession, and he had never been able to find one.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have given repeated instances.

Sir JOHN GORST: No.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he had asked the late Vice-President of the Council for a return showing how many Nonconformists were head teachers in the Church of England schools. He could point out these instances in the advertisements in the *Church Times.* All that could be said about it was that these teachers were members of one persuasion, and that was according to the trust deeds of the school. The Prime Minister had said that this was simply legalising the practice of the Education Department in the past. If it were the practice it was illegal, and therefore this Clause was simply legalising an illegal practice. Not long ago it was declared illegal for the School Boards to carry on evening schools and higher grade schools. The Committee could consider the difference between the attitude of the Government towards the illegal practice in helping sectarianism and an illegal practice when it helped education. Instead of carrying out an illegal practice which would be of benefit to the country, they brought in a Bill to destroy the power of board schools and put an end to the beneficent system. When it was an illegal practice in the interests of sectarianism, the Government brought in a Bill which not only legalised but extended the sectarianism. This was a very dangerous and pernicious Clause. The hon. Member for South Shields had pointed out the danger that in the future the burden of these schools would fall upon the rates, and this would be an inducement for them to go on establishing more sectarian schools. Take a rural parish with a population of about 1,000 or 1,200, with about 100 children in the school. In future, in such a parish it would be possible for a sect to say that that school did not represent their views, and therefore they could set up a school of their own at the other end of the parish. Where would the building come from? Hon. Members were aware that there was hardly a Nonconformist chapel or a Church of England where there was not a little schoolroom attached, and all they had got to do was to adapt that schoolroom for a day school. In this way there could be set up an innumerable number of little schools which would destroy education and promote sectarian strife. In the parish he had given as a typical concrete case, forty children would go to one school and sixty to the other. That appeared to be a direct inducement to set up rival schools for sectarian purposes. But what would happen to education? Instead of having one fairly good schoolmaster at £120 a year—it might not be a good salary, but it was fairly good in the rural districts—they would get two second or third rate masters or mistresses who would each receive £70, £75 or £80 a year, bringing up the amount paid altogether to £160. This would mean that the equipment fund would be impoverished and education would suffer. On the whole, the children of the parish would suffer for the benefit of the two rival religious communities. That was a very bad system which was being promoted by the Bill. Supposing there was abundant accommodation at the present moment for all the children of the parish, and one of the sects said, "Our children are not fairly taught the doctrines of their parents in the school," could they go to the Education Department and say, "We want another school set up"?

Mr. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): Yes, if they can get the requisite number of children.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said if it ought to be done it should be done, and if it ought not to be done it should not be done. They had to make one of two elements predominate. If it was the educational interest the sectarian interest ought to go down, and if they considered the sectarian interest was the more important, then the educational interest ought to go to the wall, but the Government could not run both. It was frankly neither one thing nor the other, and the result would be that education must suffer. In such a case as that which he had described they would get poorer teachers and equipment, and they would throw a greater burden on the rates of the parish, but the sectarian interest would benefit. Which was to be predominant in the Bill? They had a right to know. It seemed to him from the Bill as if it were the sectarian interest. Something had been said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge about the fact that there was no religious difficulty in the schools, and that they should trust to the common sense of the managers and teachers. He agreed that as a rule the teachers taught the catechism in the way least offensive to the Nonconformist children in the school. He made that admission frankly, but that would not be the case if this Clause got into operation. Why? The Low Church moderate clergyman would not want to set up a rival sectarian institution. He would be satisfied with the kind of teaching given in the parish school. It was the aggressive new man who was not satisfied at all with what was going on. As a matter of fact the clergyman of the low moderate type did not bother very much about it. He would give a quotation from the Report of the National Society, which showed really how little clergymen of that type worried about it. Dr. Reynolds, reporting on a school which he inspected, said this question was put to a pupil, "What instruction have you had in religious knowledge?" and the answer was "None;" the child was further asked "By whom was it given?" and the answer was, "By the vicar." That really represented the only definite dogmatic religious instruction given in thousands of these schools. He was not referring now to what the schoolmaster did. As a rule he confined himself to the reading of Scripture, and explaining the historical aspect of the passages read. In a good number of those schools these dogmas which they heard so much about were not thrust upon the children, but hon. Gentlemen opposite said, "You must teach these dogmas, otherwise the religious instruction given is no good." He had received a pamphlet written by Canon Moberly. When the pamphlet was first alluded to, he had thought it was written by Mr. Moberly Bell, but he had found that Mr. Moberly Bell had not exchanged thunder for theology. After reading that pamphlet it had struck him that this was Canon Moberly's Clause. It was true that at present the Church did not teach dogma in the schools, because she preferred dominion to dogma, and knew that the moment she thrust it upon the country that dominion would be withdrawn. This gentleman, who had three or four schools under his charge in a district, had advised the people not to be led by the satellites of Satan and enticed into joining leagues. But here was Clause 9, which would give the opportunity to the Canon Moberlys in the future. The result would be strife in the parish, not between High Church and Nonconformity, but between High Church and Low Church, which disliked each other more than they disliked the Nonconformists. The moderate Low Church clergyman would not set up a school to create strife, but the strong aggressive sacerdotalist would. He appealed to the Government not to destroy the efficiency of the schools by further endowing theology.

(5.45.) MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) said he did not entirely like the Amendment as it stood, but he was quite prepared to welcome it. The Clause as it stood seemed to him to be an altogether amazing one. It conferred the right of appeal on any ten ratepayers whoever they might be. It called in the Board of Education to judge in the matter. He could not help calling that dethroning the local authority and enthroning the Board of Education in its place. That was a very grave matter indeed. What was the local authority for? Surely it existed to build its own schools, and control its own money, certainly to say what its own people wanted, and to carry the wishes of its own people into action. What functions were they going to leave to it? It would have to finance the new schools which the Board of Education permitted or compelled it to build. It would also have to finance the schools which were built against its own wishes. The Government had not brought forth an authority; they had brought forth an abortion. He doubted whether the local authorities would bear this, and he did not think they ought to do so. If they refused to administer the Act, and tore off this blister placed upon their body, he, for one, should not blame them. The Clause would, in his opinion, create very great discord in the community to which it applied. Why? There would always be an appeal when a new school was wanted—it could not be otherwise—and there would probably be a society formed for the purpose. When the appeal was made the grandmother in London would put on her clogs and shawl, and go down to them and tell them what schools they ought to have, what were their own personal wishes, and how to spend their money. She ought never to have left London. The late Vice-President of the Council had said that the local authorities knew their own business far better than the Board of Education could tell them. Now the Government seemed to have got rid of his views and to have adopted precisely opposite principles. He believed the chief result would be to set the local authority and the voluntary schools by the ears and to make co-operation difficult, or even impossible, in the future. It would drive moderate Churchmen like himself to believe that the only way of establishing a national system of education was to supersede the denominational schools. It would bring the voluntary schools and the local authority into collision; it would bring the weaker into collision with the stronger, and the weaker would be destroyed. He dreaded extreme Churchmen far more than he dreaded the hon. Member for Carnarvon. The hon. Member for Carnarvon made a direct attack on the Church schools, but those extreme gentlemen made a direct attack on the State. The risk of danger seemed to be that moderate men like himself would be compelled to join their forces with men like the hon. Member for Carnarvon and make common cause with them. That certainly was not his wish, but profoundly as he differed from the hon. Gentleman in all matters of Unionism and Imperialism, he was being driven from his own side. It was not on the question of Unionism but on educational matters that he was being driven from his moorings, utterly against his will. He heartily hoped that if the Government did not accept the Amendment they would make such radical alterations in the Clause as would make it possible for him—which it was not now—to vote for the Third Reading of the Bill.

SIR EDWARD GREY said he thought the discussion of the Clause and the Clause itself were very good illustrations, if the Government would only think of it, of how the determination of the Government to secure, and even increase dogmatic teaching was imperilling the real interests of education. He could not make out whether the new Clause was a new departure or not. The right hon. the First Lord spoke of it as a new departure, but the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University said that it only allowed to be done what was done already. If it was so, there was no concession in it. There had been unanswerable speeches shewing that in so as far this Clause operated at all it would operate in the direction of making it easy for a district to have two bad schools instead of the one good one which now existed. That would make things worse for the future of educational reform. To multiply the two sets of schools with two sets of staffs would be to increase the intolerable controversy which must exist as long as they had two sets of schools side by side. What he wanted to point out was that the First Lord seemed to be fencing with the Scottish system. The whole course of the discussion pointed the moral in the direction of the Scotch system. But they could not have the Scotch system in half-a-dozen pieces. It could not be applied to one set of schools and not to another. The two great principles in the Scotch system were liberty in religious teaching everywhere and public control and management everywhere. These things should always go together, and he thought that the right hon. Gentleman should reconsider his opinion that the Scottish system was not suited to the English people. There would be no real progress in educational reform until they got rid of the religious difficulty, and it was only by a Government bold enough to adopt the Scotch system in its integrity that they would get rid of the religious difficulty. The right hon. Member for Cambridge University said that the religious peace in the schools was owing to the common sense of the teachers, but that was because the teachers softened the dogmatic teaching imposed upon them.

He agreed with the right hon Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen, that the great majority of the parents of this country would be content with plain Bible teaching for their children. [AN HON. MEMBER: "How do you know?"] How did the hon. Gentleman opposite know that the majority of the parents wanted denominational teaching? It was because the children were in denominational schools, but then the parents had no other choice at present than to send them there. As long as they had denominational control of the schools so long should they have the Cowper-Temple Clause. The right hon. Member for Cambridge University had given an instance where the religious difficulty had arisen at Barry Docks, and where the Board of Education had to intervene. A Roman Catholic school had to be established, but it was not recognised for some time. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that some time ago he had quoted the case of Barra, in the Hebrides, where the Scotch system had solved the religious difficulty at once. The right hon. the First Lord should adopt the logical conclusion of his own scheme. There were side by side in this country two systems which were intolerable from the point of view of a great many people. The First Lord said that the School Board system under the Cowper-Temple Clause would be intolerable without the denominational system alongside it. On the other hand, many people thought that the denominational system would be intolerable without the schools under the Cowper-Temple Clause. [MR. BALFOUR: "Hear, hear."] But these two intolerable systems did not make one tolerable system; and this Clause would tend to perpetuate the existing difficulties by multiplying the two different kinds of schools. Until it was recognised that the dual system must go it was impossible to make progress with educational reform.

(6.0.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that the right hon. Baronet seemed to share the delusion of the Member for North Birmingham that this Clause was aimed simply at multiplying denominational and voluntary schools. The Clause was not intended to have that effect, and it would not have that effect. It was intended to give, and what it did give, was a liberty which did not now exist—a liberty of establishing a denominational school or a provided school in districts where, under the present system, they could not be erected. Whatever the requirements of the district might be, if voluntary schools were available no other kind of school was possible. If this Bill were not passed they could not have a provided school at all. So long as the voluntary schools could provide accommodation they could not get a provided school. Even if there were a School Board it could do nothing, however much the population might prefer a board school, so long as there were a sufficient number of places in the existing schools. The system which imposed such arbitrary limitations was not good. There was a well-known case in which the school was Roman Catholic and adequate for the wants of the whole population, though the majority of that population was Protestant. It was not in the power of the Education Department or any one else to provide other school accommodation for the Protestant children of that district. In Preston at present the whole school accommodation was provided in voluntary schools, and, except for this Clause, the new education authority under the Bill would have no power to provide a school, however much the people of Preston might desire it.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): All the powers of the School Boards are to be transferred.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That made no difference where the whole ground was already covered. His hon. friend the Member for North Birmingham had got it into his head that this Clause was put into the Bill to please extreme Churchmen. He could assure his hon. friend that he held no brief for extreme Churchmen, who were perfectly well able to defend themselves, but he wished to destroy the absurd limitations to existing powers, and this Clause did that with fairness to the voluntary system and to the provided school system. Both had their freedom of action increased by this Clause, and there was no reason why it should act more in favour of one system than the other. He hoped it would operate to provide such a system of education as would suit the general wishes of the parents.

*Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) Thought the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman were based on a misconception. The right hon. Gentleman's argument was based upon future accommodation rather than the present. What the right hon. Gentleman said was that where the ground was covered by a School Board or voluntary school, a school of another type could not be set up. But the Committee must have regard to the future; to the growth of population and the new school places to be provided. While the plan of the right hon. Gentleman would relieve the present difficulty it would do so only by creating a greater difficulty for the future.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Not a greater difficulty than now.

*Mr. YOXALL: Those who wished to establish a denominational school in an area already covered by board schools could do so already, because the right hon. Gentleman below the gangway had told the Committee this afternoon that no power rested with the Education Department under the Act of 1870 to veto the erection of a denominational school in these areas, although all former presidents and vice-presidents, and all former legal authorities, held the contrary opinion. The disability was only in the establishment of board schools. There was no demand to justify this Clause, which had been inserted at the bidding of a few clerical persons and a few lay persons more clerical than the clerics. If this Clause were passed the few difficulties now experienced would be reproduced all over the land in an aggravated form. With regard to the adoption of the Scotch system he pointed out that the reason why the system acted so well in Scotland was because among the Protestants of Scotland the difference of dogma was very slight. They differed as to Church government but not with regard to dogma. The Protestants of this country differed interminably in a way quite different to what was the case in Scotland. The Scotch system would if adopted greatly increase the difficulties, and for that reason he preferred to adhere to the Cowper-Temple Clause. The friction set up by the new Clause would cause in every locality a warfare between the clericals and the local authority, which in the end would be bound to end in the nullification of this new Clause.

*Sir WILLIAM MATHER (Lancashire, Rossendale) asked the Prime Minister how he could reconcile a statement made in his speech at Manchester with the principle involved in this Clause and in Clause 10. The statement made at Manchester was to the effect that the Bill would give a power to the people, never enjoyed before, should the circumstances of the district require it, to build out of public funds a school which should suit those whom the voluntary and denominational schools of the district did not suit. That was a very specific statement, and one which, if not contravened by Clause 10, would be a very satisfactory settlement of the dispute. But under Clause 9 it would be impossible for the local education authority to proceed at once, in compliance with a demand to supply this educational want, if it had to adopt the tedious method provided. No doubt it was the intention of the Prime Minister to constitute an education authority based on public opinion absolutely responsible for the secular education of the children. But under the Clause the local authority could not build a school without consulting some other bodies, and eventually going to the Education Department, and if they could not do so without these restrictions, that was certainly not progressive education. This could not be a national system of education. He advocated that the local authority should be given power without any limitation whatever as to new schools, leaving the existing denominational schools to be dealt with on their own merits.

*Mr. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) pointed out that, as far as the Wesleyan Methodists were concerned, the proviso enabling them to erect small denominational schools in the little towns and villages was directly opposed to the educational policy of that Church, although it was true that a small section of the officials of that Church had been completely misleading the Education Department as to the feeling of the great body of the Methodist Church. The proviso might, if passed, unquestionably be used with rather startling effect against the voluntary schools established throughout the country under the control of the Anglican Church. In a village in Kent, near which he formerly lived, he had to tell the clergyman of the parish, the vicar of Bickley, that he might find it necessary to build a Wesleyan school because the clergyman had improperly treated a boy who attended that school, and also the Wesleyan Sunday school. But no sooner had he told the clergyman that he would build a school than the difficulties disappeared; the boy was re-instated, and matters went on as before. In a village in Lincolnshire the Conscience Clause had been abused. Opposite the national school there was a vacant piece of land which was put up for auction. He bade for the ground, and it was conveyed to him. No sooner did the vicar of the parish hear that he had bought the land for the purpose of building a competing Free Church school than there was a complete change in that school as to the operation of the Conscience Clause. It was clear, therefore, that the existence of this proviso would to some extent help the Free Churches, who could threaten to put up competitive schools, and so bring to book the Anglican clergy, and people of that class, who had brought great discredit on the cause of education. In the village of Dorchester, in Oxfordshire, there was only one school, with about seventy Dissenting children. These children were made to bow down to the crucifix which was erected in the school, and they were marched to Mass. There were two methods of dealing with that state of things. If the Government retained this provision in the Bill the method by which the Free Churches could bring that clergyman to book was by erecting a Free Church school, running it for twelve months, gathering into it more than thirty children, and saying to the Department, "You must now recognise us as a Nonconformist school under the Bill."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Education Department would do it.

*MR. PERKS said it would be far better for the community not to have a sectarian wrangle between different sects in the village. It would be preferable for the local education authority, who had already the control of secular education, to set up that competitive school rather than that there should be a public inquiry, involving serious sectarian strife, to decide whether the school should be Wesleyan, Roman Catholic, or Anglican. One of the largest denominations in the country—the Wesleyan Methodists—did not desire this Clause. The overwhelming majority of that body wished the new schools to be provided, not under the control of a sectarian authority, but under the control of the local public authority.

MR. M'KENNA asked what would be the effect if this Amendment were acaccepted? Would it be that the local education authority would alone be able to provide the school? He thought the effect of the Amendment, if accepted, would be that the local education authority would have the decision as to whether it, or some other persons, should provide the school. The only issue was as to who should decide by whom the new school was to be established. That was a very simple issue, and, if really understood, he believed the Committee would come to the conclusion that the Amendment ought to be accepted. Why should the local authority rather than the Board of Education decide? Because the local authority represented the locality and the parents, and was a better judge of the needs of the locality than the Board of Education could be. The Board of Education had to decide the matter according to the three conditions in Clause 10, and these conditions had been shown to favour the "other persons" as against the local authority. But that was not the worst point. If the Board of Education decided in favour of the "other persons" there was absolutely no provision in the Bill to compel them to carry out the decision of the Board, although it was proposed by an Amendment to Clause 11 to render it obligatory on the local authority to provide a school if ordered by the Board. The consequence of the want of such a power with regard to the "other persons" would be months, perhaps years, of delay, and meanwhile the school provision in the district would be insufficient and inefficient. The sufficiency of the supply was not to be determined by the Board of Education, consequently small schools would be multiplied. Under these circumstances it was surely far better to leave the local authority, if it was to be an authority at all, to decide questions of this sort. In the interest of the Education of the locality he urged that that the Amendment should be accepted.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said that this Amendment was practically the Clause; on its acceptance or otherwise depended the whole meaning of the Clause. When introducing the Bill, the First Lord of the Treasury laid great stress on Clauses 9 and 10, as remedying the Nonconformist grievance in the villages; it was therefore necessary that the right hon. Gentleman should understand why the Nonconformists did not like the Clause under consideration. In the first place, they preferred good education to sectarian division. They would rather have their children educated in a Church school, with all its Church atmosphere, than in a less efficient sectarian school, such as might be provided under this Clause. A village with just over sixty children might be equally divided between Church and Nonconformity, and it would be possible to have there two schools with only one teacher in each. Personally he would rather his child ran the risk of the Church atmosphere in one school with two teachers, because it would be a more efficient school, than have such an unfortunate division in the village. As far as the grievance of the Nonconformists was concerned, this Clause, as a remedy for that grievance, might be eliminated from consideration altogether. As to the provision of Church schools in a district in which there were only publicly provided schools, what did the Clause amount to? In such a case there were no vested interests, and there was no question of great sacrifices having been made by Churchmen in the past. It simply put it into the power of a denomination, by merely building the shell of a new school, not necessarily required, to plant the entire cost of maintenance on the ratepayers. That was not good either for the Church or for education. He supported the Amendment, not from the point of view of the Church or of Nonconformity, but because he desired to have thoroughly good education in the villages. The Clause, as it stood, distinctly tempted any fraction of the community, whether Anglican or Nonconformist, to spoil the education of a district in the interest of their particular sect, and for that reason he should vote for the Amendment.

(6.43.) Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 225; Noes, 111. (Division List No. 457).

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn J. A. (Glasgow
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Middx
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliot (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Peel, Hon Wm Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hon J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt Hon Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hon. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caine, William Sproston
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidst'ne
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George

Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mather, Sir William
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robson, William Snowdon
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hon C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes.—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur

(6.53.) Dr. MACNAMARA said the Amendment he desired to move was to insert after the word "school," in line 37, the words "or to enlarge any existing public elementary school." He admitted that these words would cover the enlargement of a voluntary school or of a provided school, but what he was anxious to secure was that, if the denominationalists desired to enlarge a public elementary school, as no doubt they would do under this scheme, they should go through the whole process of appeal, examination, and investigation, the same as any other body. The new scheme of this Bill would set up a new basis for providing school places. While there might be a deficiency of places of a certain kind, there might be a large excess of places in other schools, but the question which would determine the point would be whether there was a need of places of a particular kind.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 37, after 'school,' insert 'or to enlarge any existing public elementary school.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: I understand that the point is that, without building a new school, in the popular sense, there might be such a considerable enlargement in existing schools as to put a burden upon the rates for maintenance. That is a matter which must be dealt with in some form, and what I would suggest is, that it might be better to introduce at the end of the Clause some words to provide that, in case of enlargement, the Board of Education should determine whether, for the purposes of this section, the enlargement is such that it ought to be treated as a new school. The hon. Gentleman is perfectly right when he says that the present Bill produces a new condition of things with regard to enlargements, and he contends that the operation of the Clause in regard to the provision of new schools might be evaded by enlarging existing schools. I would suggest that it would be better to say that the case of the enlargement of a school should be dealt with by the Board of Education, and if they are of opinion that the enlargement is such that it should be treated as a new school, then they could take that course. I think that would meet the hon. Gentleman's contention. In that case I hope the hon. Member will withdraw his Amendment.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) pointed out that there was ample power now to enlarge schools, and therefore putting in these words would simply limit the enlargement of the schools by the provisions of this Clause. He certainly could not support his hon. friend's Amendment.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said it seemed to him that this was just one of the cases in which the local authority ought to have power to enlarge its schools without going to all this trouble. The Attorney

General had made a suggestion on this point, but the First Lord of the Treasury now appeared to withdraw that suggestion. This appeared to him to be a fast and loose way of doing things. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh," and "No, no."] This Bill was so drawn that a very great deal of the time which they had had to spend discussing it had been due to the extraordinary way in which the Bill was drafted, and the want of information which those interested in the measure displayed in regard to all questions connected with elementary education.

DR. MACNAMARA said that what he wanted to prevent was the unnecessary enlargement of voluntary schools, and he understood that the Attorney General agreed that something would have to be done in this respect.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: No, I made that suggestion as one likely to meet the views of the hon. Member.

DR. MACNAMARA said he gathered from the remarks of the Attorney General that something would have to be done. He did not want the local education authority to have any veto of an unreasonable character put upon it, but he did want to prevent the unnecessary multiplication by enlargements of denominational schools. He appealed to the Attorney General to do something in this matter, and in the meantime he asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. M'KENNA said they were all agreed that there ought to be power to restrain the unnecessary enlargement of voluntary schools. As the Clause stood at present they could increase them to any size they liked, and in this way they might attract from the provided schools the children who would otherwise have continued to attend those schools. On the Opposition side of the House, they thought the provisions should apply to the non-provided schools also. He understood the Attorney-General to say that if his hon. friend proposed an Amendment dealing with the non-provided schools the Government would be disposed to accept it. If that was not understood he would much prefer to go to a division on this Amendment. Before the Amendment was withdrawn he desired to know if the Government would accept an Amendment at the end of the Clause which would allow of an increase of a building amounting practically to the provision of a new school.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he had made a suggestion with a view to shortening debate which had been made an excuse for prolonging it.

MR. M'KENNA said that answer would not be likely to shorten debate. He asked the hon. Member for North Camberwell if he would at the end of the Clause move an Amendment to allow of discussion. ["No, no."]

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

(7.3.) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the word "propose," in page 3, line 37, to the word "school," in line 40, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the word "propose" in page 3, line 37, to the word "school," in line 40, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 222; Noes 107. (Division List No. 458.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex).

Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigt'n
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn Wm Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Col. C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James

Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidst'ne
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

(7.16.) Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 222; Noes, 107. (Division List No. 459.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dixon-Hartland Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Grenfell, William Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus

Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Malcolm, Ian
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Colonel William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry.
Davies Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Partington, Oswald
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pickard, Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr

Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason Eugene
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W. R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Joseph Leese and Mr. Lough.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 9:—

(9.0.) MR. HERBERT ROBERTS moved to leave out from the Clause the words, "any ten ratepayers in the area for which it is proposed to provide the school." These words, he said, gave the right of appeal to any ten ratepayers to go to the Board of Education against the erection of a school within the area in which they were interested. The point was one which did not require much argument on one side or the other. As long as the power rested with the local authorities he did not see why a few ratepayers should be allowed to intervene. He could not conceive how any useful purpose could be served by such a provision.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 40, to leave out the words 'and any ten ratepayers in the area for which it is proposed to provide the school.'"—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'and' stand part of the Clause."

THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said the proposal of the Government was that the right of appeal in the case of a new school should not be limited to the local authority which had in view the general educational interests of the area. While the local education authorities took a comprehensive view of the general educational requirements of their area, there were others who were interested. The managers of the existing school might object to the rivalry of the new school. There was another body of persons interested, and these were the ratepayers of the district in which it was proposed that a school should be established. Surely the ratepayers might be supposed to have a special knowledge of their district, and it was only fair that those interested in the locality should have an opportunity of making their voices heard.

MR. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said that, seeing there were no other speakers on the Opposition side, he concluded that Members on that side were prepared to accept Sir William Anson's statement. Under those circumstances he would not trouble the Committee with any further observations.

(9.8.) Question put.

(9.10.) The Committee divided:—Ayes, 87; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 460.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Bigwood, James
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Bull, William James
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon

Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Johnstone, Heywood
Keswick, William
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H. (M'dstone
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George David
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Herbert Roberts and Mr. Dalziel.

(9.20.) MR. M'KENNA moved an Amendment to omit the words "any ten ratepayers," and insert "a majority of the ratepayers." He said that to give to ten ratepayers the right of appeal to the Board of Education against the decision of the local education authority to provide a new school was not merely to promote, but to invite, sectarian conflict. Societies would be formed for the express purpose of urging ratepayers to combine in order to harass the local education authority in its work of providing undenominational schools. Nothing was so easy as for members of a denomination to get ten of their own faith in their own district to appeal against the local authority to the Board of Education and so hang up the whole progress of building new schools for a period of not less than three months. Was it reasonable that any ten ratepayers should have that power? Did not the managers of existing schools afford sufficient protection for denominational interests? The number certainly ought to be larger than ten.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 1, to leave out the words 'any ten,' and insert the words 'a majority of the.'"—(*Mr. M'Kenna.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'any ten' stand part of the Clause."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that hon. Gentlemen who protested against this right of appeal being given to ten ratepayers had evidently forgotten that an analogous power was given to ten ratepayers under the Act of 1870—a measure which seemed to be the object of the adoration of hon. Gentlemen opposite.

He could scarcely imagine that the Amendment asking that the appeal should only be allowed to a majority of the ratepayers had been moved seriously. The question involved was whether the ratepayers should have any voice in a matter which so vitally concerned them as the provision of a new school. Some arrangement must be made for that voice being heard; but if the Amendment were adopted it would be impossible that it could be heard, owing to the difficulty of ascertaining the views of the majority. He asked the House to reject the Amendment.

MR. FLETCHER MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston) thought the Attorney General had failed to grasp the meaning of the Clause. He had said that the interests of the ratepayers must be protected, but surely the local education authority was the very body to which ratepayers had delegated the duty of protecting their interests. It was not ten of the county ratepayers — not ten of the people who would have to pay the rates for the school—but simply ten of the ratepayers of the area of the provided school, that were to be given this power of appealing against the decision of the local education authority. They would thus be put in a position to hinder educational development.

MR. ERNEST GRAY said the hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to have forgotten the fact that the capital charge for the school was to be levied on the parish to be served by the proposed school.

MR. M'KENNA: Not the whole, but one-third.

MR. ERNEST GRAY said that, even so, the fact was a direct refutation of the argument of the hon. Gentleman. It was alleged that ten ratepayers in the district to be served by the school had no more interest in the question than the ratepayers of the county as a whole. That would be true if the building charge were spread over the whole county like the maintenance charge, but in fact it was to be levied on the particular district. It had been alleged that the Clause was designed to multiply small schools in the interests of denominations, and obviously if that were so, every check against multiplication ought to be welcomed by those who objected to the proposal of the Government. Seeing that any two persons interested in a charity could set the Charity Commission to work to produce a scheme for securing an educational rearrangement in their area, it was not unreasonable, surely, to ask that ten persons should in this matter have a power of appeal to the Board of Education. In passing, he might say he did not know where the denominations were going to find funds for the erection of schools up and down the country. It might be suggested that a claim for a particular school had been worked up by one or two interested clergymen without consulting the interests of the ratepayers who would have to bear the burden of maintaining the school, and in such a case, surely the ratepayers ought to have the right of being heard. He hoped the Amendment would be rejected.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he did not think the Clause was quite as clear as the Prime Minister seemed to imagine. The point was, whether the ten ratepayers might be from the whole area, that was to say, the whole jurisdiction, or from the parish or parishes to be served by the proposed school. In his opinion, it was exceedingly unfair that ten ratepayers—it might be ten out of ten thousand—should be able to stop the educational machinery for three or four months, when it was a question of providing schools for the children in the district. He wished to refer to another point, which was one of substance. The Government had placed the schools provided by the local authority on the same level as the schools provided by private persons. Now, local authorities would be very slow to provide schools which were not absolutely necessary, and the expense of which would be thrown on the ratepayers. Public representatives must give an account of their stewardship, and if they imposed unnecessary rates they would be called to account. The Committee might come to the conclusion that a local authority was not likely to impose a burden of this kind unless there was the strongest demand for it. Why not leave the appeal to the local representatives?

DR. MACNAMARA said that this matter was much more serious than the Attorney General imagined. The Clause said that, subject to certain conditions, any ten ratepayers might appeal to the Board of Education against the proposed new school within a period of three months. Then the Board of Education might take any time whatever for determining a proposal. The Attorney General said that this was all analogous to the Act of 1870. He ventured to submit, with great respect, that it was nothing of the sort. According to the Act of 1870 the ten ratepayers might make a representation to the Education Department, but it must be within one month, and then the Board of Education must issue the notices determining the appeal within six months. The scheme of the Clause now under discussion was far more cumbrous and dilatory than that of the Act of 1870, and far more time was wanted to put it into operation, whereas it should be more prompt. The Act of 1870 left the voluntary schools as they were, only supplementing their numbers. But this Bill did not leave the voluntary schools as they were; it revolutionised them and put them on the public rates. Now, what would happen? Many of these schools were in a hopelessly dilapidated condition, and there would be interminable haggling between the local authority and the managers on many points — the furniture, the teachers' salaries, the rental for the teachers' house, the number of the staff, and the apparatus to be provided—and the local authority might say to the managers, "We cannot come to terms with you; we will build a new school." That would happen in hundreds of cases. The arrangements for building the new school were most cumbrous, and the children might be left out of the school at a critical time of their life for many many months.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he held that the machinery provided in the present Bill was much more favourable than that in the Act of 1870. It seemed to him that it was only reasonable, if there was to be an appeal at all, that it should be a real appeal. He believed that it was the contention of all his legal friends that there should be an easy access to the Courts, that this should not be hedged round about by impediments and restrictions. In drafting this Clause the Government had acted in accordance with the policy of Parliament in making easy access to a Court of Appeal. It appeared to him to be altogether a retrograde course to set up cumbrous and difficult machinery, which was slow to work and always excited considerable antagonism and involved much cost. On these grounds he thought the Government were fully justified in the course which they had adopted.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS said he hoped the Attorney General would give his opinion of what constituted a school area from which the ten ratepayers were to be drawn. Was it to be a county area, a school district area, or a parish area?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The area encircling the schools.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS asked what that meant.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The area from which the pupils would be drawn.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS said that that was about the vaguest possible explanation which the hon. and learned Gentleman could have given. In some places the children walked seven miles to school. They yet did not know from where the ten ratepayers were to be drawn. The Attorney General quoted a precedent from the Act of 1870, but surely they had moved since then. The effect of all the restrictions on the public authority in regard to education since the Act of 1870 accounted for the fact that we had been outstripped by the United States and Germany. What other civilised country in the world would tolerate for a day those blocks against the free provision of adequate education. The words in the Clause were aimed against the publicly provided schools, and he protested against that policy. The publicly provided schools should be managed by all and for the benefit of all.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) expressed the hope that the Government would see their way to modify their proposal. It seemed to him to be impractical that any ten ratepayers could object successfully to a school being formed. It was nothing short of putting a premium on obstruction. There would always be two parties in every district, one in favour of a provided school and the other in favour of a non-provided school; and it would be perfectly easy to get ten ratepayers as objectors to any proposal whatever. He quite agreed that the ratepayers ought to have some say in the matter, and he supported the suggestion of an hon. Member that that might be done by a parish meeting.

MR. BRYCE said that the Attorney General had declared that an area meant, or implied, the district from which the children came. He never heard of such loose drafting. In the interest of good drafting, and of the correct reading of the Act, some more precise terms should be used. As it stood, whatever way they looked at it, the expression seemed to him to be extremely vague and uncertain, and there could be nothing more unsatisfactory than the whole of the Clause. He suggested an Amendment which, in the interests of avoiding trouble, would make the language more precise. If they introduced the word "parish" they would bring in the Parish Council; but the Clause, as it stood, was so vague that it was certain to cause trouble. The majority of the ratepayers proposed by his hon. friend went perhaps rather too far; but ten was too small a number. It invited captiousness, and would cause trouble; and if the Committee desired that there should be a more substantial expression of opinion from the ratepayers they should provide a larger number.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said that the area need not necessarily be a parish. It might be a district in a large town, or a combination of parishes. Surely the way to meet the difficulty as to the area was to provide subsequently that the persons who gave public notice of their intention to provide a school must state in that notice the area which it was intended to serve. That would define the area out of which the ten ratepayers who appealed should come With regard to the number of ratepayers ten was a very usual number in Local Government Acts; and it was also the number in the Act of 1870. There would be no advantage in increasing it, as ratepayers would always be found to appeal once the appeal was started. Ten, twenty, or a hundred would not make any difference.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said that the First Lord of the Treasury stated in the discussion on a previous Amendment that he was emancipating the local authority from the restrictions in the Act of 1870, by enabling them to provide schools on conditions under which the existing School Boards could not provide them. He ventured to suggest that in retaining this form of words borrowed from the Act of 1870, the right hon. Gentleman was checking the action of the local authority in providing schools, and was taking away the good effect which his own proposal reasonably and logically carried with it. There was no special advantage in the introduction of the ratepayers into the matter. The hon. Member for Wigan proceeded to argue from the Act of 1870 *a fortiori* for giving the right to the ratepayers to protest against the provision of a school; but it seemed to him that the argument was all the other way. The argument was perhaps strong when it was a question of the creation of a School Board, with all its liabilities of rating and otherwise. That was a matter on which the right might reasonably be given to the ratepayers to lay their case before the Board of Education; but with regard to the carrying out of the plain duty of the education authority - which the First Lord of the Treasury boasted he was emancipating from the restrictions of the Act of 1870, in giving greater freedom to provide unsectarian schools, whether there was any proved deficiency of accommodation or not —it seemed unfortunate that such a restriction should be introduced. He did not agree with the Amendment. He would sooner see the whole of thes words struck out without any word being put in their place. The Committe were giving quite enough in granting the right of appeal to the representatives of any existing school whose interests or usefulness might be impared.

(10.3.) Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 176; Noes, 95. (Division List, No. 461.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher. John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, SirJohnCharlesReady
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, SirHoratioD(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon, SirWilliamHart
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson. RtHn. SirJ. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, SirRobertPenrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. EdwardAlgernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. GeorgeJoachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lecky, RtHn. WilliamEdw. H.
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants. Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. CharlesW. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, WJ.H(Dumfriesshire
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, RtHn. A. Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, HonM. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hon. LionelWalter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, JamesParker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, EdwardJas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, SirMarkJ. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHn J. G. (Oxf'dUniv.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, RtHonSirWilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Welby, SirCharlesG. E (Nott.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, HenryWilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P(Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Langley, Batty
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. M'Kenna and Mr. Lambert.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the word "ratepayers" in page 4, line 1, to the word "required," in line 4, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

(10.13.) Question put, "That the Question 'That the words of the Clause from the word "ratepayers," in page 4, line 1, to the word "required," in line 4, both inclusive, stand part of the Clause,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 184; Noes, 98. (Division List, No. 462.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F

Hambro, Charles Eric
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lecky, Rt Hon William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Uni.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt. Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidst'ne
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir. A (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

(10.25.) Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 188; Noes, 100. (Division List, No. 463.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Flower, Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfo'd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawrence, W. M. F. (Liverpool)
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir William (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas

Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidst'ne
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

(10.42.) DR. MACNAMARA moved to omit all the words after "required" down to the words "to be provided" in order to insert the words "to meet any deficiency in school places." At present, he said, the only ground on which new places might be provided was that there was a deficiency in school places. But under the Bill a new basis altogether was laid down, the scheme of the Bill being that, if the places were not satisfactory from the religious point of view, then the parents of thirty school children could come forward and ask for new places. While he sympathised with the desire of the Government to meet the wishes of people from a religious point of view, he opposed that new basis of school accommodation altogether; the only ground for supplying new places should be that there was an educational deficiency. The proposal of the Bill was extravagant from the business point of view, and grotesque from the educational point of view. If the Amendment were not accepted there would be the danger of small schools being multiplied, which would be expensive and very unsatisfactory—schools, too, which when they agreed (as he hoped they would do), to a course of religious instruction which should be acceptable to every one would be left high and dry. Rather than multiply the small schools he would have the whole system of religious instruction revised from top to bottom. In any case he hoped the Government would agree that any scheme for the provision of new places should be based on the ground of the existence of an educational deficiency.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 4, to leave out from the word 'required,' to the word 'and,' in line 6, and insert the words 'to meet any deficiencies in school places.'"—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'or that' stand part of the Clause."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member has certainly put his point with commendable brevity; but the question has been discussed at great length earlier in the evening, and, therefore, it would be an impertinence on my part to do more than remind the Committee of the views of the Government on the matter. The hon. Gentleman wants to retain the existing system. Under that system it would be possible for a Protestant district to be served by a

Roman Catholic school, a Nonconformist district to be served by an Anglican school, and another locality to be served by a board school, in which, under the law as it stands, the religious teaching which the inhabitants desired cannot be given. The Government think that such a system needs elasticity. I do not think the fears of the hon. Gentleman with regard to the multiplication of schools are well founded, for the burden on the ratepayers will act as a check to any movement in that direction. I think this is quite sufficient to check any inordinate desire to multiply schools. On the other hand, the Government are of the opinion that if there be unreasonable action on the part either of the local authority or on the part of the managers of the denominational school in respect of religious teaching, it will find a very wholesome check in the possibility of another school being built. I think it will be a great reform to retain the words to which the hon. Gentleman objects, and though I understand the importance of his object from an educational point of view, I cannot go so far as to accept his suggestion.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said this Bill had already made great encroachments upon the ratepayers and taxpayers, and he thought it was time that some check ought to be put upon the expenditure under this Bill. This was a proposal which would be very severely felt, and the whole system of education would be made unpopular by the enormous expense to which the localities would be put. For that reason he thought that every safeguard ought to be put in the Bill to prevent extravagant expenditure. They had up to the present always objected to schools being built for the purpose of propagating any particular religion. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] This Bill was certainly a large encroachment upon the ratepayers and upon the taxpayers. [Renewed MINISTERIAL laughter.] He did not think hon. Members would be so anxious to laugh at the expenditure under this Bill when the country complained of it as they were at the present moment. The only people who would benefit by this Bill were those who were very rich and the poor man who had ot a real grievance would not be assisted in the least. The large population of Nonconformists would not be able to get a school of their own denomination under this Bill, which would simply give to those who were very rich, enabling them to spend large sums of money out of the public funds. They ought to do everything they could to prevent these rich people spending the public funds on their own denomination, and the Amendment moved by his hon. friend would be a great step in that direction.

*(10.50.) MR. FLETCHER MOULTON said it would be a very great assistance to the Committee if the Attorney General or the Prime Minister would assist them by defining what was meant by a necessary school. At the end of Section 10 there was a reference to "a school actually in existence," but those words were so ambiguous that he had not been able to discover what meaning should be placed upon them. He did not know whether those words meant at the date of the passing of the Act or the time when the dispute came on. He found it very difficult to discuss the Amendment now before the House, without knowing which of those two interpretations they were to take as being that which the Government intended.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The words mean schools in existence at the time the question arises, and not at the passing of the Bill.

*MR. FLETCHER MOULTON said that interpretation made it certain that the greatest curse to educational organisation would be brought about by this Bill, namely, the multiplication of small schools —too large to be effectively taught by one teacher, and too small to have more than one. If they looked carefully at the provisions which they were now discussing and the provisions of Section 10, they would see that it was quite possible for persons desirous of having a denominational school, to start a small school, and carry it on for a time. They could do this without in any way contravening the provisions of this Section, and when they got to the number of thirty scholars that school could not be held by the Board of Education to be unnecessary, and therefore, it must be for ever saddled on the ratepayers, and it must always be maintained out of the public funds. That was a thing very much to be deplored. He understood that this was suggested as being a concession in favour of Dissenters and Nonconformists. As a matter of fact it was the very opposite. One could see at once that those who, for many years past, had borne by their subscriptions the expenses of the Church schools would now be relieved of all need to subscribe for anything but the maintenance of the fabric of the school, and they would, therefore, without any strain upon themselves have funds which could be applied at any place to start such schools, and, by supporting and keeping them for a short time, they could ever afterwards get them supported by the nation.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: But such a school must first run the gauntlet of Clause 9.

*MR. FLETCHER MOULTON said the school could be started as a voluntary school without any grant, and if it got up to thirty scholars it became under the words of the Act, "a school actually in existence." Having once got it into existence they could give notice and the Board of Education was then precluded from saying that it was an unnecessary school, because it was a school actually in existence with thirty scholars. He should like to call the very serious attention of the Committee to the nature of these provisions. To his mind they were the most vital provisions in the Bill, and they were the conditions which made the prospect most gloomy. He was not the least of a fanatic with regard to how religious education should be given. On the question of religious teaching he would give the very greatest possible latitude of choice, so that he could speak with perfect freedom on the subject. What he said was that the provisions which they were now discussing and those in the following Clause were provisions not in favour of religious feeling and not in favour even of religious sacrifice, but they were provisions in favour of the richest sect. What was it that they all accepted as the consequence of denominational schools? They accepted—and this was put forward as much on the Government side of the House as upon the other—that the consequence of a denominational school was what is called a "denominational atmosphere," and that it is sought to create this atmosphere in order that those who went to that school should be led to join a particular denomination. In other words, those who had the power over a denominational school were privileged to exercise an influence over all the children who came there to turn them into members of that particular denomination. It was conceded also that they would very largely be the children of parents who did not belong to that particular denomination, and thus, by allowing a public elementary school to be denominational in return for the building being provided, they were actually putting up for sale the privilege of influencing in favour of a particular denomination the children of the poorer classes as long as time lasted. And how did they purchase this? They purchased this privilege by mere wealth. What had been the history of the voluntary schools? When they were first established those who started them bore a very large portion of the cost. Gradually those persons had been relieved of that charge, but they had a claim on their attention which neither those who sat on this or the other side of the House could shut their eyes to, namely, their past history, which was to a great extent a record of self-denial and earnest religious work. But the schools which they were discussing now had got no such history. They were the schools of the future and by these provisions they said that that sect which was rich enough to come and offer a school-house should in all cases have the privilege of proselytising amongst the children who lived near that school and that was to be done with public money. He had read over and over again the directions to the Board of Education as to how they were to decide the appeals which came before them and he found that they were framed in such a way that only one answer could ever be given. They were told that in deciding this question to which the Amendment related they were to consider the interests of secular education. Seeing that it was entirely in the hands of the local authority and done by public money, and it was the same whichever class of school they had. Then they had to consider the wishes of the parents. But these would in all cases be divided. One thing must always be in favour of the denominational school, and that was the economy of the rates. That must be so, and of these three criteria by which the arbiter was to decide, one influenced him neither way, the other was divided, and the third was always in favour of the denominational school. And just as if that was not sufficient, the Government in this Bill had made those expenses which went to the building of the school to fall heavily on small areas in order that they might be much felt. And now, as they had learned that day, the Government were going to give to these very people who would have this heavy burden placed upon them, the greatest possible inducement to appeal against a nationally provided school the right to appeal. They would get an offer to have the building expenses borne by some rich denomination and then they would have this right of appeal. When they came before the Board of Education what would the Board say? They would say, "We are bound to consider the economy of the rates. How can we decide against them?" Therefore they were now passing a scheme whereby the local education authority would be paralysed when it wanted to meet out of the national funds the national wants of the area. It could be stopped with ten ratepayers who would be the very first to smart from these building expenses, and it could require a decision to be given. Considering these things it was a certainty that any denomination which was rich enough to offer school buildings must get the privilege of denominational education as long as those schools lasted. He asked, was that fair? Had they any right to sell the religious influence over the children of the poor to the richer sects? They could not shut their eyes to this fact. They might say that they liked a religious atmosphere. To that he would say "Very well, get it." But they had no right to make wealth tell for one feather's weight in the balance. Take for example his own constituency, which contained a very large number of the smaller sects of the Methodists. They were very poor. The greater part of the land in his constituency was held by the rich people, in fact the whole of it was held by people who belonged to the Church of England. Those people could come forward and offer the land for a school building, and that would at once be "economy of the rates." A school building would be offered and the Board of Education must take the school building, and why should the children of those poor Methodists have to go day after day to a school where it was intended by the House of Commons that there should be a constant and perpetual proselytising influence at work. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no!"] He was not using the word in any abusive sense, but "proselytising" was the only English word that he knew of which would describe the taking of young people before their opinions were formed and subjecting them to influences which led them away from the natural influences of their homes. Why were these poor children obliged to go to those schools? Simply because the wealth was in the hands of the Church, and because these children belonged to the poorer sect. They could not go and offer school buildings because the fathers were too poor. Consequently, all the apparent freedom which was given by these Clauses to all sects was completely denied to the poor sects. The consequence was that these poor people had to send their children to the schools of other denominations simply because their fathers were too poor to provide school buildings. If an Education Bill was to work smoothly, it must be because it appealed to the sense of fairness of the English people. That was the deepest sense which was set in the heart of an Englishman. If they did what they were now proposing, he was perfectly certain that there would be a feeling of unfairness rankling in the minds of those people, and it would be a just feeling, and a feeling which they could not say was unreasonable; and that feeling would be detrimental to the working of this Bill, and make the work of education a source of strife as long as these provisions lasted. By the Amendment which had been proposed they were cutting all these dangers out and allowing the Board of Education to decide whether there were enough places or not. Surely what was proposed to be done by the Amendment had nothing whatever to do with denominational or undenominational teaching. Let the Board of Education decide a thing which was only a matter of statistics, of which it had had some experience, and in such matters the Board would be a good arbiter.

(11.7.) LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said the hon. Member had made one of the most unfair speeches to which he had ever listened. The hon. Member had repeated again—until, as he should have thought, the contradiction of it would have now become tedious—the old charge that the Church of England desired the use of these schools for the purpose of converting people from their own way of thinking. [AN HON. MEMBER: "So they do!"] That charge had over and over again been repudiated. The hon. Member went on to say that the only principle which was to guide the Board of Education in this matter was economy of the rates, and that with the Bill before him which said in express terms that the first consideration was to be the interests of secular instruction, and the second the wishes of the parents. It was perfectly clear that if this Amendment was carried the Board of Education would be entitled to consider neither the interests of secular education nor the wishes of the parents. The hon. Member opposite had just put forward an argument which ruled out the three considerations provided for in Clause 10.

*MR. FLETCHER MOULTON: No, two out of the three.

LORD HUGH CECIL said that one of those considerations was the wishes of the parents, and yet the hon. Member had the controversial audacity to come forward in the defence of parents' rights. He spoke on behalf of poor Methodists who were dragged into Church schools and proselytised against their wills. That was one of the very things the Board of Education were enjoined to consider. They had to consider the feelings of the parents before they considered the question of wealth, about which the hon. Member had poured forth a great deal of rhetoric intended to be pathetic, but which was absolutely nauseous. If the controversy was to be carried on by imputing to opponents a desire to use their wealth in order to convert persons to their religious way of thinking, it would create a great sense of bitterness. He repudiated any such desire on the part of the Church of England. The Roman Catholics did succeed in providing their schools, and they were the denomination most anxious for this particular Clause. It was not a clause to which the Church of England attached great importance, but it was one to which the Roman Catholics attached great importance. They had poor districts, and they were reasonably anxious to provide for the wants of their people. He could not conceive why hon. Members opposite should persist in ignoring the fact that a great part of the population of this country, Roman Catholics and members of the Church of England, genuinely desired to have their children brought up in their own faith. The local authority was entitled to make provision to meet any case of difficulty. The only other part of the Clause to which the hon. Member took objection was that which provided that people who desired to make provision for children of their own faith should not be forbidden to do so.

MR. TREVELYAN said the Attorney General had stated in reply to the hon. Member for the Launceston Division that by a school actually in existence was meant a school actually in existence at the time that a question arose. If, therefore, a school was found to be in existence, and there were thirty scholars in it, the managers might claim a public grant, and the local authority could not refuse it.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said if the school came into existence after the passing of the Act, it would be subject to the conditions imposed by Clause 9.

MR. TREVELYAN said that was an important omission, and it was necessary to make that interpretation clear. Unless that was made perfectly clear, numbers of small schools might be built, thirty children put into them, and grants claimed.

MR. LOUGH said the Amendment provided two things—that the State schools in this country should be provided in accordance with the number of children to be provided for, and that schools should not be provided if not required by the number of children for whom the State should care. He ventured to say that these two principles governed the action of the State in every civilised country in the world. What was the great reform suggested by the Prime Minister? It was that gradually each sect might build a separate school for its own purposes. He thought he had not described the system unfairly. There was not a country in the world where there were so many sects as in England, and each of these sects could now build a little school of its own in every parish. He supposed this was the right hon. Gentleman's way of meeting the grievances of the Nonconformists, who complained that in 8,000 parishes they were obliged to send their children to the school of another denomination over which the State had no control. The local education authority would have control over secular education, and it would have representation on the boards of management. What was proposed was that the children should be broken up into sets, and that small schools should be multiplied, with the result that the educational facilities of the country would be weakened and reduced. He regarded Clause 9 as the worst in the Bill. It swept away the solemn obligation resting upon the local authority to provide for every child. It was a Clause which would develop the sectarian differences from which already this country suffered more than any country in the world.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich had in the course of his speech indulged in language rather more discourteous than usual in his references to the learned Gentleman. The noble Lord had taken the case of the Roman Catholics. It was a very favourite controversial device of hon. Gentlemen opposite to cite the case of Roman Catholics. They knew very well that it was essentially different. There was no charge of proselytising brought against the Roman Catholics. The essential difference between the Roman Catholic and the Anglican schools was that the Catholic schools were really Catholic schools, while the Anglican schools were not Anglican schools. In Catholic schools they would not find more than one per cent. of the children who were not Catholic children. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Yes."] He did not mean to say that they would not find a school here and there where there were not more, but taking these schools generally throughout the country they would not find more than one per cent. who were not Catholics. How did that bear on proselytising? It was all very well fo the noble Lord to take a high line, but he either ignored or did not know the facts. It was within the knowledge of almost every Member that in Anglican schools inducements which were not spiritual were brought to bear on children to persuade them to quit the faith of their fathers and become members of the Anglican Church. In almost every school which he knew in Wales the teachers were Nonconformists who had been lured from the Nonconformist faith by the offer of a position in that school as a teacher. The teachers had been kidnapped. There were 60,000 of these teacherships, and they were used for proselytising by means which were not religious or spiritual, but purely temporal. The money of the State was used for the purpose of buying the children before they knew what they were about. Nothing but the efficiency of education ought to be considered. Suppose there were five sects in a parish—he understood the Prime Minister was willing that each should have its school. Was that the noble Lord's view?

LORD HUGH CECIL: It will depend on the circumstances of the case.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked what were the circumstances of the case? The Prime Minister was right and logical, and he did not talk about the circumstances of the case. If one sect had a right to a school, each of the five sects had an equal right. What would that mean in several parts of England and Wales if, where there were four or five sects, more or less equal, each demanded a school? The whole parish was just sufficient to provide one decent school, yet five little miserable seminaries would be run. But it was said some must make a sacrifice. Who would have to make the sacrifice? The poorest sect of the lot. As a rule, the richest sect, which insisted upon its pound of flesh, was the very sect which did not send its children to these schools. The fact was that everybody in the parish, for the sake of education, had got to make a sacrifice. What was wanted was equal sacrifice on the part of every denomination, and one school for all those districts instead of many. The Committee had heard a great deal from the Prime Minister about the Scottish system. Why had the reference to Scotland been dropped? Because hon. Members on the Opposition side had shown an inclination to accept it. The Scottish system was a dialectical "try on" by the Prime Minister. This was a case similar to the Scottish system which took into account how many schools were needed and their efficiency, and he therefore invited the Prime Minister to try the Scottish system in this Bill.

Sir WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead) said he should like the Prime Minister, who was a countryman of his own, to end the whole of the debate on the Education Bill by standing up and asking the House to accept the Scotch system. He had never attempted to interfere in the debates in any shape or form; but he had listened to all the speeches, and he could only say he was sorry to see so much sectarianism introduced into them. They in Scotland knew nothing of that whatever. Their education was as their sentiments were—free. It was an evidence of their freedom from the thraldom of ecclesiasticism and sacerdotalism. As a countryman of the Prime Minister, he wanted him to stand up and ask the Committee to accept the Scottish system. He believed the Committee would accept it. By that means the whole controversy would be ended, and they would get away much sooner than they anticipated. He had heard hon. Gentlemen opposite arguing the claims of their sect at the expense of other sects. That was not fair or right. He objected to education being allied to religion or to politics. His principle was—and it was the Scottish system—that education should be national and entirely apart from religion or politics. On that ground alone, the Committee ought to rise to the occasion, and put education in England and Wales on the same lofty basis as it was in Scotland. The Prime Minister knew exactly what the Scottish system was. The right hon. Gentleman knew the freedom that was there; and that there was no sectarianism or quarrelling there Why had they it in England? Were they civilised in England yet? The Prime Minister knew Scotland better than he did, but he was an older Scotsman than the right hon. Gentleman. He was educated partly in a parish school, and he knew all about it. The Prime Minister knew all about it too. Let the right hon. Gentleman give the same system to England, and England would be happy. Why did he not do it? It would get over all the difficulty. There was no use in wasting the time of hon. Members when the issue was so simple. Why did the right. hon. Gentleman not do it? He would tell the Committee. It was because ministers had the Church influence prodding them on to courses which were antagonistic to the true principles of education. There was no doubt about that. He would appeal, as a Scotsman to a Scotsman, and he would ask the Prime Minister to say that he would introduce the Scottish system into the Bill; and then all this desultory debate would end. [HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] Hon. Members opposite cheered that; but would they support the Prime Minister if he did? They would not. Their sectarianism and churchmanism would prevent them voting for it; and the right hon. Gentleman knew that. He would ask the Prime Minister, however, to pass them by, and introduce the Scottish system. Then the Bill would go through quickly. But if the right hon. Gentleman refused, Nonconformists and Scotsmen would fight it to the bitter end.

(11.38) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 187; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 64).

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hon. J. (Birm.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin, Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fr'd Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hanbury, Rt. Hon Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Morgan, David J. (Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Shef'ld
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allan, Sir Wm. (Gateshead)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffiths, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Loyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norman, Henry
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Pease, J.A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

(11.50) Question put accordingly, "That the words 'or that' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 183; Noes, 82 (Division List No. 465).

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H'nry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, Wm. Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Fr'derick
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside

Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants, Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Colonel Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. CharlesW. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, SirLewis, Edinb'rgh, W.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell, WJ H(Dumfriesshire
More, RobertJasper(Shropshire
Morgan, David J(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, RtHn A. Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Peel, HonWmRobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W(Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, SirMarkJ. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, RtHn. J. G. (Oxf'dUniv.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, SirWilliamEdw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, ColSirC. E. H(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. HnSirWilliam H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. Taunton
Welby, SirCharlesG. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, CharlesP. (Glouc., Stroud
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir FrancisH(Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. HnHerbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir Wm. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. HnC. R. (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J (York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Dr. Macnamara and Mr. Trevelyan.

It being after Midnight, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the Business.

(12.0) MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question 'That the Clause stand part of the Bill' be now put."

Question put, "That the Question 'That the Clause stand part of the Bill' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 181; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 466.)

AYES

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,AugustusH'nryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst,Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb,Sir JohnCharlesReady
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross,Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon.Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes,Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson,RtHn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore,HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore,Hon.S.F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen,Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hanbury,Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Keswick, William
Lambton,Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Lucas,Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell,WJH(Dumfriesshire
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,David J.(Walth'mst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray,Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan,Col. John P.(Galway,N.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Peel,HnWm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hn.M.W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild,Hon.LionelWalter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, JamesParker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart,SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,RtHn.J.G(Oxf'rdUniv.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.Sir CEH(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Warde, Col. C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt-Col. A.C.E.(Taunton
Welby,SirCharlesG.E.(Notts)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson,A.Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson-Todd,Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen,CharlesP.(Glouc.,Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James

Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Edwards, Frank
Evans.SirFrancisH(Maidst'ne
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey,Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayne,Rt.Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan.E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomas,F. Freeman-(Hastings
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke, (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and
Mr. William M'Arthur.

(12.13) Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 176; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 467.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen,August'sHenryEden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour,RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Banbury, Frederick George
Bartley, George C. T.
Bathurst,Hon.AllenBenjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Brymer, William Ernest
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carew, James Laurence
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb,SirJohnCharlesReady
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cranborne, Viscount
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland SirFredDixon
Dorington,Rt.Hon. SirJohn E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke,RtHon.SirWilliam Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fellowes,Hon.Ailwyn Edward
Finch, George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald,SirRobertPenrose-
Fitzroy,Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Gore,HnG.R.C Ormsby-(Salop
Gore,Hon.S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon.George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hanbury,Rt.Hon.Robert Wm.
Hardy,Laurence(KentAshford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Sir Alexander
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse, Henry(Somerset,E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood
Kemp, George
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,Col.Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Maxwell,WJH(Dumfriesshire
More,Robt.Jasper(Shropshire)
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamst'w
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.

Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Peel, Hn. W. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sheffield
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Channing, Francis Allston
Cremer, William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth, R., Leicester
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mather, Sir William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Walter
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

The CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 16th October last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXIII.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the Lords.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2)	*Mr. Wyndham*	Read 2° 22nd Oct. (550) Committee Report 24th Oct. (788) Read 3° and passed (1059)
*County Courts (Ireland) [H.L.]	*Mr. Wyndham*	Bill withdrawn 20th Oct. (344)
*Dogs' Regulation	*Mr. Hanbury*	Bill withdrawn 16th Oct. (136)
*Education (England and Wales)	*Mr. A. J. Balfour*	Committee, 16th Oct. (97), (111) Committee 17th Oct. (142) Committee 20th Oct. (253) Committee 21st Oct. (360) Committee 22nd Oct. (492) Committee 23rd Oct. (639), (705) Committee 24th Oct. (728) Committee 27th Oct. (831) Committee 28th Oct. (951) Committee 29th Oct. (1079), (1156) Committee 30th Oct. (1197) Committee 31st Oct. (1311) Committee 3rd Nov. (1403)
*Employment of Children	*Mr. Ritchie*	Bill withdrawn 16th Oct. (136)
*Expiring Law Continuance	*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*	Second Reading (adjourned) 20th Oct. (341) Read 2° 21st Oct. (425) Committee 22nd Oct. (553) Committee 30th Oct. (1304)
*Fisheries (Ireland)	*Mr. Wyndham*	Second Reading (adjourned) 21st Oct. (453)
*Hospitals (Contributions)	*Mr. Walter Long*	Bill withdrawn 16th Oct. (135)
Innkeepers' Liability	*Mr. Broadhurst*	Read 1° 22nd Oct. (492)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Land Purchase (Ireland)	*Mr. Wyndham*	Bill withdrawn 20th Oct. (341)
*Lands Valuation (Scotland) Amendment [H.L.]	*The Lord Advocate*	Bill withdrawn 16th Oct. (135)
*Local Authorities (Bill in Parliament)	*Mr. Walter Long*	Read 2° 21st Oct. (447)
*London Elections	*Mr. Walter Long*	Bill withdrawn 16th Oct. (135)
*Marine Insurance [H.L.]	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Bill withdrawn 16th Oct. (136)
*Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment [H.L.]	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Bill withdrawn 16th Oct. (135)
*Merchandise Marks (Prosecutions) (Ireland)	*Mr. Wyndham*	Bill withdrawn 16th Oct. (344)
*Militia and Yeomanry	*Mr. Brodrick*	Read 1° 23rd Oct. (638)
*Naval Prize	*Mr. Arnold-Forster*	Bill withdrawn 16th Oct. (136)
*Patent Law Amendment	*Mr. Gerald Balfour*	Consideration, 21st Oct. (441) Read 3° and passed 21st Oct. (441)
*Police Expenses	*Mr. Jesse Collins*	Bill withdrawn 16th Oct. (35)
*Police Superannuation	*Mr. Jesse Collins*	Bill withdrawn 16th Oct. (135)
Poor Law Superannuation (Ireland) (No. 2)	*Mr. O'Malley*	Read 1° Oct. 21st (360)
*Queen Anne's Bounty	*Mr. Hanbury*	Bill withdrawn 16th Oct. (136)
*Supreme Court of Judicature [H.L.]	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Read 1° 17th Oct. (142)

APPENDIX II.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1902.

List of Rules, Orders, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

[Continuation of List given in preceding Volume.]

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Additional Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland, dated 3rd September 1902 [41 and 42 Vic., c. 66, s. 6.]	16 October	40 days
Factory and Workshop Acts (Special Exception—Night Work—Lead and Zinc Mines),—Copy of Order, dated 22nd August 1902, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 54 of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, extending the special exception under that section to concentration works at Lead and Zinc Mines, so far as regards young persons of the age of 16 years and upwards [1 Edw. VII., c. 22, s. 126 (3)]	16 October	40 days
Factory and Workshop Acts (Dangerous and Unhealthy Industries),—Copy of Regulations dated 12th August 1902, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 79 of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, for the manufacture of felt hats where any inflammable solvent is used [1 Edw. VII., c. 22, s. 126 (3)]	16 October	40 days
Public Records (Treasury),—Copy of Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents which have been removed from the Solicitor's Department of the Treasury to the Public Record Office, but which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein [40 and 41 Vic., c. 55, s. 1]	16 October	4 weeks
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Cambridge),—Copy of Statutes made by the University of Cambridge under The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877, and sealed on 27th May 1902, amending the Statutes of the University [40 and 41 Vic., c. 48, s. 50]	21 October	12 weeks
Inebriates' Regulations,—Copy of Regulations made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department by virtue of Section 20 of The Inebriates Act, 1898, for carrying into effect the provisions of Section 5 of The Licensing Act, 1902, respecting the detention of Inebriates committed to Retreats [61 and 62 Vic., c. 60, s. 21 (1)]	27 October	4 weeks (whilst the House is sitting)
Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts,—Copy of Rule amending Rule 7 of the Register of Patent Agents Rules, 1889 [46 and 47 Vic., c. 57, s. 101 (5)]	5 November	40 days

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

THIRTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1902.

OCTOBER 16—*NOVEMBER* 3.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENTS AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in the Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote. Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Abertysswg

Colliery Explosion, Gallantry of Miners—Recognition of, by award of Albert Medal, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1396.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Glamorgan, Rhondda]

Abertysswg Colliery Explosion. Gallantry of Miners—Recognition of, by award of Albert Medal, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1396.

Accidents

Portsmouth Gun Accident—Inquiry into Death of Seaman Cosham.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1383.

Railway Accidents.

Board of Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 8, 21.

Monasterevan Railway Accident, Cause of—Company's delay in reporting Accident to the Board of Trade.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 230.

Aden

Hospital Arrangements for Troops engaged in Somaliland Operations.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 799.

Adjournment of the House

Autumn Sittings, Appropriation of, for Government Business—Power of the House to discuss urgent Questions on a Motion for Adjournment.

Observations on the Motion for Precedence of Government Business, Oct. 16, 30, 33, 73, 74, 77.

Motions for Adjournment under Standing Order XVII.

Adjournment of the House—*cont.*

Anderson, Sergeant, Refusal of the Irish Government to dismiss from the Constabulary (Mr. S. MacNeill), *Oct. 23*, 633.

Anglo-American Relations (Mr. W. O' Brien) *Oct. 22*, 491.

Belfast—Disturbance on Custom House Steps (Mr. Devlin), *Oct. 23*, 638, 687.

Crimes Act (Ireland) 1887—Proclamation of the City of Dublin and Nine Irish Counties, Harsh and Partisan Administration of the Act (Mr. W. O'Brien), *Oct. 27*, 830, 890.

Speaker's Rulings, *see* Speaker.

Sullivan, Sergeant, Charges against (Mr. W. O'Brien), *Oct. 20*, 248, 307.

Admiralty

First Lord—Earl of Selborne.

Secretary—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Civil Lord—Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

Cunard Liners—Designs for New Liners to be subject to the Approval of the Admiralty, Fitting with Water-tube Boilers, etc.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1392.

Adriatic

Status quo, Maintenance of, H.M. Government's Policy—Agreement between France and Italy, alleged.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 608.

Adulteration

Dairy Products—Proposed International Conference.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 799

Afghanistan

Arms and Munitions of War, Purchase of, in Germany—Landing at Kurrachee and Conveyance across British Territory, Consistence with Agreement between Afghan and British Governments.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 205.

Russia and Afghanistan.
Direct Diplomatic relations, Establishment of.
Diplomatic Communications.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 208.

Laying on the Table of the House, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 794.

Discussion in the House, Opportunity for, prior to Arrangement between British and Russian Governments.
Q. *Oct. 31*, 1309.

Understanding as to Sphere of Influence, Terms of.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1061.

Africa, Central

British Central Africa—Order in Council Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347 ; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Africa, East

British Protectorate.
Court of Appeal—Order in Council, Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347 ; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Order in Council Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347 ; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Pemba, Slavery in—Slave owners retaining possession of Slaves by claiming them as Concubines, Right of Appeal under Article VI. of Decree of 1897—Case of Msichoke.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 350.

Somaliland, *see* that title.

Uganda Railway.

Balance Sheet, Laying on the Table of the House, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 609.

Report of Mombasa-Victoria Committee on Progress of Works, Presented, *Oct. 28*, 938 ; *Nov. 3*, 1375.

Africa, South

Cape Legislature, Members of—Fraudulent attempts by British Officers at Graaf Reinet to obtain evidence of Malpractices during the War.
Q. *Oct, 22*, 467.

Compensation for Losses during the War, Boer Losses—Limit of time during which Applications may be lodged.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1391.

Africa, South—*cont.*

Concentration Camps—Cost of Maintenance since the War.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 944.

Martial Law.

Commission of Inquiry—Report, Date of Presentation to the House.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 359.

Prisoners sentenced by Military Courts in Cape Colony, Release of, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1067.

Natal—Scarlet Fever Outbreak, Want of Precautions in isolating Battalion of Imperial Yeomanry, alleged, etc.—Inquiry proposed.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 464.

Portuguese Possessions.

Agreement between H.M. Government and Germany relating to—Communicating Terms to Parliament.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 471.

Delagoa Bay—Negotiations to secure British Management for Harbour and Railway.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1394.

Remount Farms at Clark's Siding, Fraudulent Transactions.

Farms of 9,030 Acres leased as containing 14,000, etc.—Communicating particulars of Transactions to Parliament.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 215.

Inspection previous to April, 1902—Name of Officer, etc.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 215.

Potatoes grown during Government Leases and sold to private advantage, etc.—Inquiry.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 465.

Responsibility of General Officer commanding Eastern District.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 215.

Settlement of South Africa.
Chamberlain, Mr. J., and Boer Generals, Interview between, Sept. 5, 1902—Papers relating to, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 17.

Discussion in the House, Opportunity for.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 944.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony, *see* those titles.

Africa, West

Lagos—Lifeboat sent out to the Government, Condemnation on arrival alleged.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 219.

Nigeria—Importation of Liquor, Imposition of Prohibition Rates, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1389.

Sekondi Pier, *see* that title.

Sierra Leone, *see* that title.

[*cont.*

Africa, West—*cont.*
- Spirits, Importation of Over-proof Spirits—Legislation proposed.
  Q. *Nov. 3*, 1389.
- Waima Arbitration—Date of Payment of Compensation by French Government, Distribution of Money.
  Q. *Oct. 27*, 794.

Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
- Grants to Counties of Armagh, Down, Antrim, Derry, and Connaught, during year ending March 31, 1902—Amounts.
  Q. *Oct. 23*, 601.
- Report for year ending March 31, 1902—Date of Presentation.
  Q. *Oct. 23*, 601.

Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2.) Bill
- *c.* 2R. *Oct. 22*, 550.
  com. Oct. 23, 724; *Oct. 24*, 738.
  Report.* *Oct. 24*, 788.
  3R.* *Oct. 28*, 1056.
- *l.* 1R.* *Nov. 3*, 1378.

Agriculture, Ireland
- Basic Slag, Importation of inferior Slag—Enforcing Provisions of Fertilizer and Feeding Stuffs Act.
  Q. *Oct. 20*, 211.
- Statistics Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 20.

Aird, Stornoway
- School Playground—Provision of Shelter for use in severe weather proposed.
  Q. *Nov. 3*, 1381.

Aldershot
- Hospital—Discharge of Private Snowling while suffering from Typhoid, alleged—Inquiry proposed.
  Q. *Oct. 21*, 351.

Algeria
- Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 1, 17.

Alien Immigration
- Royal Commission—Date of Presentation of Report.
  Q. *Oct. 27*, 809.

Allan, Sir W. [Gateshead.]
- Cunard Company's New Liners—Designs to be subject to the approval of the Admiralty, Fitting with Water-tube Boilers, etc., *Nov. 3*, 1392.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 3*, 1499.
- Indian Railways—German Locomotives for East Indian Railway, Defective Cylinders, alleged, *Oct. 30*, 1192.
- "Montagu," H.M.S.—Trial Trip, Unsatisfactory condition of Belleville Boilers, *Oct. 27*, 806.
- "Novik," Russian Second-class Cruiser, Speed of, *Oct. 30*, 1191.
- "Terrible," H.M.S.
  - Date of leaving Hong Kong, Number of days occupied in reaching Portsmouth and amount of Coal consumed—Capability of maintaining designed speed, *Oct. 20*, 224.

Allan, Sir W.—*cont.*
  - Gun-Carriage used at Ladysmith, Designer of, *Oct. 20*, 224.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
- Ireland.
  - Blacksod Bay — Port of Call for alleged subsidised Line of Steamers to run between Liverpool and Canada, *Oct. 22*, 482.
  - Stoney Estate Foreshore Rights—Owner of Rostock Castle prosecuting Migratory Labourers for gathering Seaweed, Representation of the Crown at Castlebar Trial, *Oct. 20*, 207.

America
- *see* United States.

American Express Company
- Arrangements with the British Post Office for transmission of Parcels—Express Companies in the United States declining to facilitate, alleged
  Q. *Nov. 3*, 1385.

Anderson, Sergeant, R. I. C.
- Duties performed by Sergeant Anderson.
  Q. *Oct. 27*, 822.
- Retention in Royal Irish Constabulary, Charges of Perjury against Anderson.
  Q. *Oct. 23*, 627.
  - *Motion for Adjournment* (Mr. S. MacNeill), *Oct. 23*, 633.

Anglo-American Relations
  - *Motion for Adjournment* (Mr. W. O'Brien), *Oct. 22*, 491.

Animals
- Diseases of Animals.—Orders in Council Presented *Oct. 20*, (113) 204; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Anson, Sir W.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education* [Oxford University.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 165, 182, 183; *Oct. 20*, 278, 280, 283, 287; *Oct. 21*, 377, 414, 419; *Oct. 23*, 646, 662, 664, 707, 710; *Oct. 24*, 732, 755, 768; *Oct. 27*, 889; *Oct. 28*, 979, 1008, 1021, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1027, 1031, 1033, 1034, 1040, 1053; *Oct. 29*, 1093, 1096, 1097, 1123; *Oct. 30*, 1242, 1277, 1282, 1288; *Oct. 31*, 1316, 1339, 1361; *Nov. 3*, 1470.
  - Women, Eligibility of, *Oct. 27*, 812.
  - *See* also *Erratum.*

Anstruther, Mr. H. T. — *Lord of the Treasury* [St. Andrews Burghs.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 27*, 773.

Appropriation-in-Aid
- South African War—Terminal Charges, Authority for Expenditure.
  Q. *Nov. 3*, 1394.

Archdale, Mr. E. M. [Fermanagh, N.]
Foot and Mouth Disease—Estimated loss incurred by Farmers through importation of Cattle from abroad, *Nov. 3*, 1397.
Ireland—Hard Labour Sentences under the Crimes Act, Government Instructions to Resident Magistrates, alleged, *Oct. 27*, 818.

Argentina
Cattle, Importation into Great Britain for slaughter, proposed, Security against admission of diseased Cattle—Negotiations with Argentine Government.
Q. Oct. 20, 228.
Opportunity for Discussion prior to removal of restrictions.
Q. Oct. 20, 229.
Report of Remount Committee showing existence of Foot and Mouth Disease.
Q. Oct. 20, 228.

Arms Act
see Peace Preservation Act.

Arms and Ammunition
Afghanistan - Purchase of Arms, etc., in Germany, Landing at Kurrachee and Conveyance across British Territory, Consistence with Agreement between Afghan and British Governments.
Q. Oct. 20, 205.
Export of from Birmingham to Ireland—Provisions of Peace Preservation Act of 1881.
Q. Nov. 3, 1400.
Guns—Machine Guns, Number of Yeomanry Regiments supplied with.
Q. Oct. 22, 464.

Army
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. St. John Brodrick.
Under Secretary—Earl of Hardwicke.
Financial Secretary—Lord Stanley.
Africa, South, Military Forces in—Return for 1899-1902, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5.
Barracks.
Dingwall, Erection of Barracks during the ensuing year.
Q. Oct. 28, 941.
Dublin, Lack of Accommodation.
Q. Oct. 21, 351.
Brushes, Distribution of Hair Brushes free to Cavalry, but not to Infantry, alleged.
Q. Oct. 27, 802.
Canteens—Date of Publication of Report.
Q. Oct. 30, 1188.
Cavalry.
Height—Maximum and Minimum Standards.
Q. Oct. 29, 1072.

Army—*cont.*
Cavalry—*cont.*
Outfit, Cost of in Jan. 1900, compared with cost of Yeomanry Outfit.
Q. Oct. 23, 602.
Character Certificates given to Soldiers who served in South Africa, Production of—Post Office Notice.
Q. Oct. 22, 464.
China, British Operations in 1900—Gratuities for the Forces.
Q. Oct. 23, 596.
Commissions — Militia and Yeomanry Officers granted Commissions for services in the Field, Placing on equal footing with those gazetted from Sandhurst.
Q. Nov. 3, 1391.
Contracts—M'Connachie Brothers' Contract for supplying Tinned Rations to the Troops in South Africa, Number of Tins rejected—Fair Wage Clause in Contract.
Q. Oct. 28, 941.
Coronation Medal for Troops sent home from South Africa for the Coronation—Regulars not taking part owing to postponement, Medal for, proposed.
Q. Oct. 22, 468.
Employment of Discharged Soldiers and Reservists, *see* Soldiers.
Guns—Machine Guns, Number of Yeomanry Regiments supplied with.
Q. Oct. 22, 464.
Horses, *see* that title.
Hospitals—Shorncliffe, Establishment of Isolation Hospital, Hospital close to the Hythe to Sandgate Road, proposed.
Q. Oct. 31, 1306.
Lorries—Report on trials of self-propelled Lorries, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 19.
Militia, *see* that title.
Officers.
Continental Long-distance Rides, Participation of British Officers.
Qs. Oct. 20, 213.
Re-employed Officers of Regiments serving at home during the South African War—Promotion Claims.
Q. Oct. 27, 801.
Pay, Non-effective Pay and Allowances—List of exceptions to Regulations, Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347.
Pensions—Return of specially granted Pensions, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 19.
Prisons.
Report on Discipline and Management, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 19.
Soldiers undergoing imprisonment, Reconsideration of sentences.
Q. Oct. 20, 214.
Remounts, *see* Horses.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
- Reserve.
  - Numbers—Effect of new Proposals for re-engagement of Time-expired men. *Q.* *Oct. 22*, 469.
  - Officers—Promotion for Officers of Regiments serving at home during the South African War, Consideration of Claims. *Q.* *Oct. 27*, 801.
- Reservists—Grievances of Time-expired Reservists.
  - Arrears of Pay. *Qs.* *Oct. 23*, 603.
  - London Public Meeting—Steps taken to remove Grievances. *Q.* *Oct. 20*, 212.
- Schools—Provision of adequate supply of Teachers, Religious Instruction, etc. *Q.* *Oct. 22*, 468.
- Seaforth Highlanders, Second Battalion, Date of return from South Africa—Quartering Battalion in Scotland proposed. *Q.* *Oct.* 24, 728.
- Soldiers, *see* that title.
- Teeth—Defective Teeth, Number of Men invalided from South Africa, Improving Dental Condition of the rank and file. *Q.* *Oct. 28*, 941.
- Time-expired Men, Terms of Re-enlistment. *Q.* *Oct. 29*, 1073.
- Transport Service, *see* that title.
- Volunteers, *see* that title.
- Yeomanry, Imperial, *see* that title.

Army Medical Corps
- Civil Surgeons attached to the Corps during the South African Campaign, Honours and Emoluments. *Q.* *Oct. 29*, 1072.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Belfast, N.]
- Cruisers — "Drake" Class of Cruisers capable of Competing with Foreign Armoured Commerce Destroyers, Speed, etc., *Oct. 30*, 1190.
- Cunard Company's New Liners—Designs to be subject to the approval of the Admiralty, Fitting with Water-tube Boilers, etc., *Nov. 3*, 1392.
- Fleets of the World—Alteration in Method of Compiling Return, *Oct. 23*, 605.
- "Montagu," H.M.S. —Trial Trip, Unsatisfactory Condition of Belleville Boilers, *Oct. 27*, 806.
- Reserve—Drill, Facilities for Men to perform their Annual Drill abroad, *Oct. 30*, 1190.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*cont.*
- "Terrible," H.M.S.
  - Date of leaving Hong Kong, Number of days occupied in reaching Portsmouth and amount of Coal consumed—Capability of maintaining designed speed, *Oct. 20*, 224.
  - Gun-Carriage used at Ladysmith, Designer of, *Oct. 20*, 224.

Arsenals
- Woolwich Arsenal.
  - Foremen's Pensions under New Pension Scheme. *Q.* *Oct. 28*, 945.
  - Paymaster acting as Assessor and Collector of Income Tax, Altering Procedure proposed. *Q.* *Oct. 27*, 805.

Ashton, Mr. T. G. [Bedfordshire, Luton]
- Piccadilly, City and North-East London Railways Bill, *re-com.*, *Oct. 29*, 1141, 1142, 1143, 1153, 1156.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H. [Fife, E.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 27*, 859, 860; *Oct. 28*, 1004, 1005.

Assam
- Tea Gardens, Excessive Number of Government Liquor Shops—Inquiry into Excise Arrangements of the Province, Laying Papers on the Table of the House. *Q.* *Oct. 20*, 225.

Assizes
- Winter Assizes—Orders in Council relating to, Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Asylums
- Lunatic Asylums—Granting Return. *Q.* *Oct. 28*, 942.

Athlone
- Income Tax Appeals, Number lodged—Dissatisfaction as to increase in Assessments, alleged. *Q.* *Nov. 3*, 1384.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Londonderry, N.]
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *com.* *Oct. 22*, 559.
- Maher, M. T., Trial for riotous behaviour—Sentence of hard labour, alleged, *Oct. 22*, 475.
- Sullivan, Sergeant, Charges against.
  - Charge against the Government of procuring Sullivan's acquittal while knowing him to be guilty, etc., *Oct. 20*, 320, 321, 322, 324, 325, 326, 328, 329, 334, 335.

[*cont.*

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Sullivan, Sergeant, Charges against—*cont.*
M'Hale *v.* Sullivan—Laying Shorthand Writer's Report of Civil Action on the Table of the House proposed, *Oct. 27*, 825.

Atlantic Shipping Trade
Cunard Company, *see* that title.
Government Agreement with Mr. Pierpont Morgan.
Opportunity for discussion.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 227.
Papers—Laying on the Table of the House.
Qs. *Oct. 17*, 141 ; *Oct. 20*, 227, 228.
Payments by H.M. Government—No financial burden on the Exchequer.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 228.

Attorney-General
Rt. Hon. Sir R. Finlay.

Attorney-General for Ireland
Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.

Australia
Pacific Islanders resident in Queensland—Exemption from Terms of Pacific Islands Labourers Act.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 466.

Austria-Hungary
Extradition Treaty between Great Britain and Austria-Hungary, Amendment of Articles of Treaty of 1873.
Declaration Presented, *Oct. 16*, 7, 25.
Order in Council Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347 ; *Nov. 3*, 137.
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Autumn Sittings
Appropriation of, for Government Business.
" Forty Days on the Table " Motions, Discussion after Twelve o'clock at Night.
Q. *Oct. 16*, 26 ; *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *Oct. 16*, 26 ; Mr. G. Bowles, 37 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 48.
Opportunity for Discussion of Urgent Business other than Government Business, Position in 1893, etc.
Observations on the Motion for Precedence of Government Business, Oct. 16, 30, 32, 33, 50, 51, 73, 77.
House of Lords—Short Adjournment, there being no business for the House to consider immediately.
Os. Earl Spencer, Duke of Devonshire, *Oct 16*, 10 ; *Nov. 3*, 1378.
Procedure Rules, Drastic Nature of the New Rules.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Oct. 16*, 32 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 51.

Autumn Sittings—*cont.*
Supply—Unprecedented Procedure and contrary to the Sessional Supply Order to introduce new Estimates after the Committee of Supply was closed and the Appropriation Act passed.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *Oct. 16*, 36 ; Sir W. Harcourt, 47.

Avoch
Channel, Scheme for Lighting, Carrying into effect.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 794.

Baghdad
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Bahamas
Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Bain, Col. J. R. [Cumberland, Egremont]
Militia and Yeomanry Officers granted Commissions in the Army for Services in the field—Placing on equal footing with those gazetted from Sandhurst, *Nov. 3*, 1391.

Baird, Mr. J. G. A. [Glasgow, Central]
"Islay," Steamship, Cause of Stranding—Delay in lowering Boat, alleged, *Oct. 23*, 597.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill
c. *con.** *Oct. 16*, 109.
3R.* *Oct. 20*, 202.
l. Commons Amendts. *con.** *Nov. 3*, 1373.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury* [Manchester, W.]
Africa, South.
Martial Law, Commission of Inquiry—Report, Date of Presentation to the House, *Oct. 21*, 359.
Settlement of South Africa, Taxation of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies—Opportunity for Discussion, *Oct. 28*, 944.
Business of the House.
Course of Business.
Autumn Sittings, Statement on Business proposed, *Oct. 16*, 29—Reply to Comments and Criticism, 47, 50, 60, 73.
Statements and Replies to questions, *Oct. 20*, 245 ; *Oct. 21*, 360 ; *Oct. 29*, 1079 ; *Oct. 30*, 1197 ; *Nov. 3*, 1406.
Precedence of Government Business for the remainder of the Session, *Oct. 16*, 28.
Dardanelles Question, Settlement by Arbitration—Austrian Premier's alleged Statement, *Oct. 21*, 360.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *Oct. 16*, 112, 113, 114, 119, 120, 124, 125, 126, 128, 129; *Oct. 17*, 144, 145, 147, 156, 172, 175, 176, 178, 179, 188, 189, 195; *Oct. 20*, 258, 287, 289, 291, 295; *Oct. 21*, 363, 364, 365, 369, 388, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 396, 397, 401, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416; *Oct. 22*, 495, 504, 508, 510, 511, 516, 517, 520, 783, 785, 786, 788; *Oct. 27*, 836, 838, 840, 843, 856, 858, 860, 866, 885, 887; *Oct. 28*, 952, 953, 954, 958, 959, 960, 967, 972, 977, 981, 982, 994, 1001, 1013, 1047, 1048, 1050, 1053, 1054, 1055; *Oct. 29*, 1083, 1089, 1091, 1092, 1103, 1132, 1135, 1136, 1158, 1159, 1161, 1163, 1177; *Oct. 30*, 1201, 1202, 1210, 1211, 1237, 1244, 1248, 1255, 1265, 1266, 1276, 1278, 1280, 1285, 1286, 1287; *Oct. 31*, 1325, 1327, 1328, 1349, 1355, 1362, 1363; *Nov. 3*, 1409, 1424, 1426, 1433, 1435, 1436, 1449, 1450, 1451, 1453, 1462, 1481, 1488, 1501, 1505.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill.
  - Amendment to Clause 8 needful to bring it into harmony with Mr. Balfour's Statements at Manchester, alleged, *Oct. 21*, 358.
  - Denominational Schools leased to School Boards—Termination of Agreement and use of Buildings as a Denominational School, *Oct. 27*, 829.
- Employment of Children Bill—Facilities for Re-introduction, *Oct. 27*, 829.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 2R., *Oct. 21*, 433, 435.
- Gibraltar Defences—Publication of Engineer's Report, *Oct. 21*, 358.
- Ireland.
  - Condition of—Opportunity for Discussion during the Autumn Sittings, *Oct. 16*, 60, 61, 73, 74.
    - Special Facilities requested by Irish Members, *Oct. 16*, 26, 27, 28; *Oct. 20*, 246, 247, 248; *Oct. 22*, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489; *Oct. 23*, 631, 632, 633.
  - County Court Judges—Submitting Salaries to the Criticism of the of the House, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 827.
  - Hard Labour, Number of Sentences under Criminal Law and Procedure Act, 1887, during Mr. Balfour's Irish Administration, *Oct. 20*, 239.
  - Lord Lieutenant's Allowance, Supplementary Vote, *Oct. 16*, 30.
- Local Government (Ireland) Act (Amendment) Bill—Facilities for Discussion, *Oct. 27*, 828.
- Marine Insurance Bill, Re-introduction of, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 828.
- Members of Parliament withdrawn from the Service of the House by Sentence of Courts of Law without Communication to the House, *Oct. 16*, 66.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

- Persia, British Trade with—Agreement between Turkey and Persia affecting treatment in respect of Customs Duties of British and Indian Goods, Representations to the Grand Vizier of Persia, *Oct. 21*, 357.
- Questions in the House—Arrangements for Answering Questions left over when the Time Limit is reached, *Oct. 20*, 246.
- Somaliland Operations, Progress of, *Oct. 21*, 360.
- Sugar Convention.
  - Giving Effect to—Legislation, *Nov. 3*, 1405.
  - Sanction by Parliament—Adequate time for Discussion of Resolution, *Oct. 27*, 829.
- Voluntary Schools.
  - Endowments—Return showing Capital and Income of each Endowment, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 830.
  - Trust Deeds.
    - National Society Trust Deed, Laying on the Table of the House, *Oct. 30*, 1197
    - Precedents, Copies of—Date of laying on the Table of the House, *Oct. 30*, 1196.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*President of the Board of Trade* [Leeds, Central]

- Alien Immigration, Royal Commission on—Date of Presentation of Report, *Oct. 27*, 809, 810.
- Atlantic Shipping Trust and Cunard Company, Government Agreements with, Laying Papers on the Table of the House—Opportunity for Discussion, Payment to Cunard Company, etc., *Oct. 20*, 228.
- Dingwall and Cromarty Railway—Progress of Scheme, *Oct. 23*, 610.
- Ireland.
  - Inch Strand Foreshore Right, Interference with—Ascertaining High Water Mark, Inquiry, *Oct. 27*, 826.
  - Monasterevan Railway Accident, Cause of—Company's Delay in reporting to the Board of Trade, *Oct. 20*, 230.
  - North Sea Fisheries Investigation—International Expenditure, Amounts to be expended by Countries interested, *Oct. 23*, 610.
  - Patent Law Amendment Bill, *con.* *Oct. 21*, 442, 445, 447.
  - Penrhyn Quarry Dispute—Application by parties interested for appointment of Board of Conciliation, *Oct. 29*, 1073.
  - Railway Servants' Hours of Labour, Reduction of, proposed, *Oct. 29*, 1074.

Ballina
Post Office—Change of Site.
Q. Oct. 23, 595.

Ballot Act of 1872
Objections to Inclusion in Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—Making Perpetual, proposed, etc.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Oct. 21*, 427; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 433; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, *Oct. 22*, 555.

Ballymoney
Post Office—Negotiations for acquiring New Site, alleged.
Q. Oct. 23, 596.

Bangkok
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Bank Holidays
Postal Officials—Payment in lieu of Leave, Refusal of, alleged.
Q. Nov. 3, 1385.
Royal Progress on 25th Oct.—Bank Holiday Proclamation.
Q. Oct. 20, 222.

Banking
Ireland—Statistics Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 20.

Barbados
Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Barley
Returns—Double Return proposed, distinguishing between Malting and Grinding Barley.
Q. Oct. 22, 472.

Barracks
Constabulary, Royal Irish—Insufficient Barrack Accommodation.
Q Oct. 21, 351.
Dingwall—Erection of Barracks during the ensuing year.
Q. Oct. 28, 941.
Dublin—Lack of Barrack Accommodation for Soldiers.
Q. Oct. 21, 351.

Barrow River
Drainage Works—Giving effect to Recommendations of Commission of 1885.
Q. Oct. 29, 1063.

Barry, Mr. E. [Cork County, S.]
Ireland—Basig Slag, Importation as a Fertilizer, Inferiority of Slag—Enforcing Provisions of Fertilizer and Feeding Stuffs Act, *Oct. 20*, 211.

Bartley, Mr. G. C. T. [Islington, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 29*, 1116; *Nov. 3*, 1438.
Local Authorities' Bills—Date of taking—*Nov. 3*, 1407.
Perry, Private—Services in South Africa, Injury sustained in the field—Eligibility for Allowance, *Oct. 23*, 602.

Basig Slag
Importation into Ireland as a Fertilizer, Inferiority of Slag—Enforcing Provisions of Fertilizer and Feeding Stuffs Act.
Q. Oct. 20, 211.

Bayley, Mr. T. [Derbyshire, Chesterfield]
Post Office Employees' Grievances—Committee of Inquiry proposed, *Oct. 21*, 349.
Transvaal—Grant of £3,000,000 for restocking Boer Farms, etc., Amount spent, *Oct. 23*, 608.
Uganda Railway—Laying Balance Sheet on the Table of the House, proposed, *Oct. 23*, 609.

Beckett, Mr. E. W. [York, N.R., Whitby]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 30*, 1243.

Belfast
Constabulary, Royal Irish.
Number stationed in Belfast—Religious Denominations.
Q. Oct. 23, 600.
Promotions—Withdrawing proposed. Return giving Number and ature of Prosecutions instituted by Candidates for Promotion.
Q. Oct. 23, 628.
Custom House steps, Disturbance on Collection of Money, Prohibition of, proposed.
Q. Oct. 27, 812.
Motion for Adjournment (Mr. Devlin), *Oct. 23*, 638, 687.
Anti-Catholic Nature of Meetings held on Steps, 689, 698, 700.
Collection, the real cause of Disturbance, 689, 693, 700.
Peoples, Rev. Mr., besieged by Mob — Church Windows broken, etc., 689.
Railing in the Steps, proposed, 692, 696, 700.
Sloan, Mr., Attack on, in Parliament, 689—Mr. Sloan's reply, 692, 693, 694, 698.
Trew's, Mr., Supporters, the cause of Disturbance, 696.
Railing in Steps, proposed.
Q. Oct. 21, 356; *Oct. 23*, 624.
Orange Institution, Illegal Pressure on Member for South Belfast and Mr. S. Boal—Proclaiming Institution, proposed.
Q. Oct. 27, 814.
Parliamentary By-Election—New Member sworn for Southern Division, *Oct. 16*, 15.
Postal Arrangements — Delay in the Delivery of Letters.
Q. Oct. 27, 797.
Unlawful Assemblies, Number of Prosecutions under the Crimes' Act during the past two years.
Q. Nov. 3, 1404.

Belfast Lough
Naval Training School, Establishment of, proposed—Visit of Guardship to the Lough.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 350.

Belgium
Brussels, *see* titles Brussels and Sugar Bounties Convention.
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Bell, Mr. R. [Derby.]
Business of the House—Precedence for Government Business for the remainder of the Session, *Oct. 16*, 78.
Monasterevan Railway Accident, Cause of —Company's Delay in reporting to the Board of Trade, *Oct. 20*, 230.
Railway Employees' Hours of Labour—Date of Presentation of Return, *Oct. 23*, 598.
Workmen's Compensation Act—Medical Referee acting as Medical Witness, Case of Peart *v.* Furness, *Nov. 3*, 1395.

Belleville Boilers
"Montagu," H.M.S., fitted with Belleville Boilers—Unsatisfactory Results of Trial Trip.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 806.

Bengal
Barmaids—Viceroy rescinding Order of Local Governor prohibiting employment of Women.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 352.

Berlin
London and Berlin, Establishing Telephonic Communication between.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 617.

Bermuda
Boer Prisoners, Repatriation of—Number still in Bermuda.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 804.

Bethnal Green
Vaccination Prosecution—Sale of Bicycle distrained for non-payment of Fine.
Q. *Oct. 31*, 1310.

Bhownaggree, Sir M. [Bethnal Green.]
Bethnal Green Vaccination Prosecution—Sale of bicycle distrained for non-payment of Fine, *Oct. 31*, 1310.

Bignold, Mr. [Wick Burghs.]
Seaforth Highlanders, Second Battalion—Date of Return from South Africa, Quartering Battalion in Scotland, proposed, *Oct. 24*, 728.

Bill, Mr. C. [Staffordshire, Leek.]
Leek Post Office—Date of commencing building of New Office, *Oct. 27*, 798.
Waima Arbitration, Date of payment of compensation by French Government —Distribution of Money, *Oct. 27*, 794.

Birmingham
Arms and Ammunition exported to Ireland—Circular to Manufacturers.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1400.

Birr
Gaelic Association Sports boycotted by United Irish League.
O. Mr. Wyndham, *Oct. 27*, 924.

Black, Mr. A. W. [Banffshire]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 23*, 667; *Oct. 24*, 738, 739.

Black Sea
Russian Warships, Ingress and Egress through the Dardanelles — Negotiations for opening the Dardanelles to Russian Warships only, alleged—H. M. Government's Policy.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 359.

Blacksod Bay
Port of Call for alleged Line of Subsidised Steamers to run between Liverpool and Canada.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 482.

Boer Generals
Cambridge — Disturbances at Meeting addressed by the Boer Generals.
Qs. *Oct. 28*, 944; *Oct. 30*, 1193.
Interview with Mr. J. Chamberlain (Sept. 5, 1902)—Papers relating to Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 17.

Boilers
Belleville Boilers—Unsatisfactory Results of H.M.S. "Montagu's" Trial Trip.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 806.
Naval Ships fitted with Scotch Boilers and Water-tube Boilers, Comparisons between—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 24.

Boland, Mr. J. [Kerry, South]
Ireland.
  Lehud Fishing Harbour, Improvement of — Congested Districts Board contributing towards Cost, *Oct. 23*, 599.
  Staigue Fort—Calling attention of Board of Works to condition of Fort, *Oct. 20*, 210.
Marine Works (Ireland) Act, Application for Assistance under the Act—Consideration of Claims of Kenmare Port *Oct. 21*, 354.

Bond, Mr. E. [Nottingham, E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 30*, 1284, 1290.

Boscawen, Mr. G. [Kent, Tunbridge]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 29*, 1087, 1088; *Oct. 31*, 1320, 1354.

Bousfield, Mr. W. R. (Hackney, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 28*, 1009; *Nov. 3*, 1470.
Piccadilly, City, and North-East London Railways Bill, *re-com. Oct. 29*, 1155.

Bowles, Mr. G. [Lynn Regis]
Atlantic Shipping Trust and Cunard Company, Government Agreements with, Laying Papers on the Table of the House—Opportunity for Discussion, Date of First Payment by H.M. Government, *Oct. 20*, 227, 228.
Business proposed for the Autumn Sitting—Precedence of Government Business, Taking Supply during Autumn Sittings, etc., *Oct. 16*, 34.
Congo Free State—Seizure by German Force in Sept., 1900, of portion of Free State, alleged, *Oct. 22*, 470.
Dardanelles, Austrian Premier's Statement as to Settlement of Question by Arbitration—Negotiations for opening the Dardanelles to Russian Warships, alleged, *Oct. 21*, 359.
Education, Board of—President's Salary, Methods of providing during Current Financial Year, *Oct. 20*, 220.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 22*, 521; *Oct. 31*, 1353.
Garter, Order of—Number of Foreign Sovereigns on whom the Garter has been conferred since 1837, Number not of the Christian Faith—Return proposed, *Oct. 20*, 221.

Germany.
Great Britain and Germany, Secret Treaty between, alleged—Communicating Terms to Parliament, *Oct. 22*, 470, 471.
Portuguese Possessions in South Africa—Existence of Agreement between H.M. Government and Germany, *Oct. 22*, 471.
Gibraltar Defences—Publication of Report of Engineer, *Oct. 21*, 357, 358.
Honours—Exercise of Royal Prerogative on advice of Ministers or otherwise, *Oct. 20*, 221.
Navy—"Commerce Destroyers," Meaning of Term, *Oct. 30*, 1191.
Persia, British Trade with—Agreements between Russia and Persia and Turkey and Persia, affecting British and Indian Trade—Laying Correspondence with Indian Government on the Table of the House, proposed, *Oct. 21*, 357.
Somaliland—British Military Operations.
Cost of—Portion to be borne by British Revenues, etc., *Oct. 27*, 793.
Foreign Office, Responsibility for Conduct of Campaign, *Oct. 20*, 223.
Consultation with War Office, *Oct. 28*, 947.
Progress of Events, *Oct. 23*, 609; *Oct. 30*, 1190.

Bowles, Mr. G.—*cont.*
South African War, Terminal Charges—Authority for Expenditure, *Nov. 3*, 1395.
Sugar Bounties Convention, Ratification by Feb. 1st, 1903—Sanction of Parliament, Government intentions as to asking for Sanction during present Session, *Oct. 20*, 220; *Nov. 3*, 1405.
Transvaal Loan, Date of introducing Bill, *Nov. 3*, 1406.
Purposes to which Proceeds are to be applied, *Oct. 22*, 472.

Boycotting and Intimidation by the United Irish League.
Catholic Priests, Attitude of.
O. Mr. Wyndham, *Oct. 27*, 922.
Curran's, Judge, Preference for serious, ordinary crime to boycotting.
O. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 27*, 898.
Increase in boycotting, etc., the cause and justification of the Proclamations under the Crimes Act.
O. Mr. Wyndham, *Oct. 27*, 198.
Land Question—Effect of Boycotting and Intimidation in postponing settlement of the Land Question.
O. Mr. Wyndham, *Oct. 27*, 917.
Ordinary Law—Government had not attempted to deal with Boycotting and Intimidation under the Ordinary Law.
O. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Oct. 27*, 930.
Press—Local Press Campaign initiated in October, 1901.
O. Mr. Wyndham, *Oct. 27*, 922.
Roscrea Case, Birr Athletic Sports, etc.
O. Mr. Wyndham, *Oct. 27*, 923.
Thompsons at Templemore, Case of—Corofin Case, etc.
O. Mr. Wyndham, *Oct. 27*, 920.

Boyle
Constabulary, Royal Irish—Extra Force alleged.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 950.

Brakes
Continuous Brakes on Railways—Return Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1376, 1380.

Braunton Lighthouse
Telephone, Connecting Lighthouse with—Provision of Money.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 795.

Braybrooke, Lord
Sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother, *Nov. 3*, 1373.

Brazil
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Brigg, Mr. J. [York, W.R., Keighley]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 21*, 359, 375; *Oct. 22*, 496; *Oct. 24*, 745; *Oct. 28*, 994; *Oct. 30*, 1246.
Patent Law Amendment Bill, *con. Oct. 21*, 444.

Bright, Mr. J.
Statue in Houses of Parliament—Removing to better position in the outer Lobby, proposed. *Q.* *Oct. 23*, 615.

Brighton Vale
Martello Tower, Sale of—Amount realised. *Q.* *Nov. 3*, 1404.

Bristol
Foreign Animals Wharf Orders Presented, *Oct. 20*, 204; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Broadhurst, Mr. H. [Leicester]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 27*, 889; *Oct. 30*, 1236.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. W. St. John—*Secretary of State for War* (Surrey, Guildford)
Coronation Medal for Troops sent home from South Africa for the Coronation—Regulars who did not take part owing to Postponement, not receiving the Medal, *Oct. 22*, 469.
Irish Railways—Transport of Troops, Selection of Routes, *Oct. 23*, 629.
Prisons—Number of Soldiers in Civil Prisons for Military and Criminal Offences respectively, *Oct. 28*, 945.
Remount Department.
  Accommodation for, Difficulties of procuring Accommodation adjacent to the War Office—Delay in increasing Staff on the outbreak of the South African War, alleged, *Oct. 23*, 606.
  Conduct of, by General Truman—Inquiry, Commander-in-Chief's Opinion, *Oct. 23*, 606.
Reserve—Numbers, Effect of New Proposals for re-engagement of Time-expired Men, *Oct. 22*, 469.
Schools—Provision of adequate supply of Teachers for Army Schools, Religious Instruction, etc., *Oct. 22*, 468.
South African War—Members of Cape Parliament, Fraudulent attempts by British Officers at Graaff Reinet to obtain Evidence of Malpractices against Members, *Oct. 22*, 468.
Volunteers—Musketry Regulations, Consultation with Representative Volunteer Officers prior to issue of new Regulations, *Oct. 23*, 605.
Woolwich Arsenal Foremen's Pensions under new Pension Scheme, *Oct. 28*, 945, 946.

Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway (New Lines, etc.) Bill
c. con. *Oct. 16*, 110.
3R* *Oct. 20*, 202.

Brown, Mr. A. H. [Shropshire, Wellington]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 17*, 175.

Brunner, Sir J. T. [Cheshire, Northwich]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 22*, 497.

Brushes
Army Hair Brushes, Distribution free to Cavalry but not to Infantry, alleged. *Q.* *Oct. 27*, 802.

Brussels
London and Brussels, Establishment of Telephonic Communication between. *Q.* *Oct. 23*, 617.
Military Ride from Brussels to Ostend, Participation of British Officers. *Qs.* *Oct. 20*, 213.
Sugar Bounties Convention, *see* that title.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J. [Aberdeen, S.]
Business of the House—Course of Business, *Oct. 30*, 1197; *Nov. 3*, 1405.
Business proposed for the Autumn Sittings—Position in 1893, Opportunity for discussing Urgent Questions, etc., *Oct. 16*, 30, 61.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 16*, 119; *Oct. 17*, 158, 175, 189; *Oct. 20*, 289; *Oct. 21*, 365, 379; *Oct. 22*, 492, 493, 494, 495, 508, 510, 536, 546; *Oct. 23*, 643, 655, 662, 707, 723, 724; *Oct. 24*, 729, 731, 759, 783; *Oct. 27*, 835, 837, 838; *Oct. 28*, 953, 955, 957, 958, 969, 976, 989, 1027, 1037, 1054, 1056; *Oct. 29*, 1086, 1087, 1088, 1106, 1107, 1124, 1136, 1160, 1165, 1166; *Oct. 30*, 1198, 1211, 1225, 1231, 1282, 1287, 1288; *Oct. 31*, 1312; *Nov. 3*, 1426, 1428, 1431, 1433, 1477.
Sugar Convention, Discussion in the House prior to Ratification, *Nov. 3*, 1405.

Bulbs
Irish Parks, Tenders for Bulbs—Accepting lowest Tender. *Q.* *Oct. 23*, 630.

Bull, Mr. W. J. [Hammersmith]
Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill, 3R, *Oct. 16*, 109.

Burke, Mr. Haviland [King's County, Tullamore]
Imprisonment of Mr. Burke under provisions of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887—Communication to the Speaker, *Oct. 16*, 12.

Burma
Barmaids—Viceroy rescinding Order of Local Governor prohibiting employment of Women. *Q.* *Oct. 21*, 352.

Business of the House
Course of Business—Mr. Balfour's Statements and Replies to Questions, *Oct. 20*, 245; *Oct. 21*, 360; *Oct. 29*, 1079; *Oct. 30*, 1197; *Nov. 3*, 1406, 1407.
Statement on Business proposed for the Autumn Sittings, *Oct. 16*, 28.

cont.

Business of the House—*cont.*
- Precedence of Government Business for the remainder of the Session.
  - *Motion* (Mr. Balfour), *Oct. 16*, 28.
- Transvaal Vote—Date of taking.
  - *Q. Nov. 3*, 1406.

Butcher, Mr. J. G. [York.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 30*, 1247.

Buxton, Mr. S. C. [Tower Hamlets, Poplar.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 23*, 641, 714; *Oct. 24*, 743; *Oct. 28*, 957, 963, 1023, 1030; *Oct. 29*, 1093, 1105, 1107, 1127, 1128; *Oct. 30*, 1207, 1237; *Nov. 3*, 1460.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 2R., *Oct. 21*, 436.

Cable Communication
- Hong Kong and England — Reducing Rates.
  - *Q. Oct. 28*, 948.

Caicos Islands
- Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Caine, Mr. W. S. [Cornwall, Camborne.]
- Burma—Barmaids, Withdrawal of Order prohibiting the Employment of Women, *Oct. 21*, 352.
- Ceylon — Increase in Importation of Opium, Inquiry proposed, *Oct. 20*, 216.
- China—British Military Operations, 1900—Sale of Surplus Stores of Rum, Rule as to supplying Spirits to Soldiers in the Field, *Oct. 30*, 1183.
- Cornish Miners, Phthisis among—Number of Cases, Number of Deaths since 1895, *Oct. 29*, 1066.
- Fiji, Federation with New Zealand—Fijian Petition to King Edward desiring Federation, alleged, *Oct. 20*, 216.
- India.
  - Assam Tea Gardens, Excessive Number of Government Liquor Shops, Inquiry into Excise Arrangements of the Province—Laying Papers on the Table of the House, *Oct. 20*, 225.
  - Bengal — Barmaids, Withdrawal of Order prohibiting the Employment of Women, *Oct. 21*, 352.
  - Education.
    - Law Classes
      - Closing of, proposed—Protecting Interests of the poorer Students, *Oct. 27*, 800.
      - Revising Presidency College Classes, and abolishing affiliated Classes proposed *Oct. 27*, 800.
    - Universities Commission Report, Educational Policy founded on Report—Opportunity for discussion in the House prior to Adoption, *Oct 27*, 800.

Caine, Mr. W. S.—*cont.*
- India—*cont.*
  - Financial Obligations in Imperial Matters — Agreement between Imperial and Indian Governments —Publication of Correspondence.
    - *Q. Oct. 27*, 806.
  - Imperial Council, Holding Session at Delhi on occasion of the Coronation Durbar, proposed, *Oct. 20*, 225.
- Indian Budget, etc.—Opportunity for Discussion, *Oct. 16*, 37.
- Irish Grievances, Opportunity for Discussion—Refusal of Demand unless made on behalf of the Opposition, *Oct. 23*, 633.
- Somaliland—British Military Operations, Cost of—Charging portion upon Indian Revenues, *Oct. 27*, 807.
- Transvaal Mines.
  - Mine owners and Working Miners, Disputes between—Establishment of Board of Arbitration, proposed, *Oct. 29*, 1068.
  - Phthisis, Number of Cases, Number of Deaths, etc., since re-opening of the Mines, etc., *Oct. 21*, 352; *Oct. 29*, 1069.
  - Summary of Regulations and Laws, Publication of proposed, *Oct. 29*, 1068.

Caldwell, Mr. J. [Lanark, Mid]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 169.
- Elementary School Teachers' Deferred Annuity Funds—Date of Circulation of Accounts, *Oct. 29*, 1062.
- Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament) Bill, 2R. *Oct 21*, 449, 451.
- Patent Law Amendment Bill, *con. Oct. 21*, 441, 446, 447.
- Supreme Court Judicature Bill, 2R., *Oct. 21*, 460.

Cambridge
- Boer Generals, Meeting addressed by—Disturbances.
  - *Q. Oct. 28*, 944; *Oct. 30*, 1193.

Cambridge University
- Statutes amending Statutes Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347; *Nov. 3*, 1378.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. (Stirling Burghs.)
- Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887—Inadequacy of Reasons given for Proclamations under the Act, Crimelessness of Ireland Severity of Sentences given under the Act, etc, *Oct. 27*, 928, 930.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Oct. 24*, 785, 786; *Oct. 27*, 849; *Oct. 30*, 1303.
- Ireland, Condition of—Opportunity for discussion – Irish Members' Demand for Special Facilities, *Oct 20*, 247, 248; *Oct. 22*, 484, 485, 486, 489; *Oct. 23*, 631.

[*cont.*

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*cont.*

Questions in the House—Arrangements for answering Questions left over when the Time Limit is reached, *Oct. 20*, 246.

Somaliland—British Military Operations. Progress of, *Oct. 21*, 360.

Retirement of Col. Swayne—Information as to Events, *Oct. 20*, 222.

Canada

Cattle, Healthiness of—Abrogation of Embargo on Sale in English and Scottish Markets, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1397.

Great Britain and Canada—Agreement between for subsidised Line of Steamers to run between Liverpool and Canada, alleged.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 482.

Postage Rates between Canada and Great Britain—Lowering Rates, proposed, *Oct. 28*, 948.

Canal Tolls, Ireland

Reduction of, to correspond with Railway Rates, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1387.

Canteens

Army Canteens—Date of Publication of Report.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1188.

Cape Colony

Military Courts, Prisoners sentenced under—Release of, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1067.

Parliament, Members of—Fraudulent Attempt by British Officers at Graaf Reinet during the War to obtain Evidence of Malpractices against Members.
Q. *Oct 22*, 467.

Capital Punishment

Ireland—Rules for regulating the Execution of Capital Sentences, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 23.

Cardiff

Pilotage By-Laws—Order in Council Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Carmarthenshire

Muzzling Order, Date of withdrawing.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 798.

Castlebar

Court House, Use of, for Public Meetings—High Sheriff's Right to forbid Meetings.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 824.

Castlerea

Constabulary, Royal Irish—Extra Force, Number of—Cost, etc.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 950.

Cattle and Live Stock

Argentine Cattle Trade, *see* Argentina.

Canadian Store Cattle, Healthiness of—Abrogation of embargo on sale in English and Scottish Markets, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1397.

Foot and Mouth Disease—Loss suffered by Farmers through Importation of Cattle from Abroad.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1397.

Importation of Cattle from the Colonies—Colonial Conference Negotiations.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 353.

Transvaal—Tax on Imports of Live Stock.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1071.

United States Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Cavalry

Maximum and Minimum Standards of Height.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1072.

Cavan

Assizes, White Glove Calendar—Withdrawal of Proclamation under the Crimes Act, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1403.

Cawley, Mr. F. [Lancs., Prestwich]

Patent Law Amendment Bill, *con. Oct. 21*, 442, 445.

Cecil, Lord Hugh [Greenwich]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 175, 176; *Oct. 20*, 270; *Oct. 21*, 417; *Oct. 23*, 664; *Oct. 27*, 870, 871; *Oct. 28*, 985, 1049; *Oct. 29*, 1109, 1114; *Oct. 30*, 1281, 1297, 1298; *Oct. 31*, 1327, 1328, 1330, 1354, 1355, 1358; *Nov. 3*, 1422, 1495, 1498.

Census

England and Wales—Returns Presented *Oct. 16*, 4, 21; *Nov. 3*, 1377, 1380.

Cereals

Registration Duty on Imported Cereals—Calculation by the Quarter or the Hundredweight.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 472.

Ceylon

Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Boer Prisoners in, Repatriation of—Number still in Ceylon.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 804.

Opium, Increase in Importation of—Inquiry proposed.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 216.

Chairman of Committees (Lords)

Earl of Morley.

Chairman of Committees

Rt. Hon. J. W. Lowther

Chamberlain, Mr. A.—*Postmaster General* [Worcestershire, E.]
Hong Kong Cable Communication.
Eastern Extension Telegraph Company, Agreement giving Preferential Right to Company, *Oct. 30*, 1193.
Reducing Rates proposed, *Oct. 28*, 948.
Post Office.
Canadian Postage Rates—Lowering Rates proposed, *Oct. 28*, 948.
Ireland.
Leenane Post Office—Religious Tests for Employees, *Oct. 22*, 473.
Limerick.
Postmastership, Appointment of Irish Roman Catholic, proposed, *Oct. 20*, 230.
Punishment of Staff, Reconsideration proposed—Custody of Safe, *Oct. 27*, 827.
Stornoway Mail Service, Delays in—Communication addressed to Contractor, *Oct. 22*, 474.
Telegraph Service.
Competitions for Post of Telegraph Learner—Number of Candidates and number of Vacancies at the last open Competition, etc., *Oct. 27*, 810.
Employees—Royal Progress, Granting same Concessions to London Telegraphists as on Coronation day, *Oct. 22*, 473.
Scotland, Communication with—Frequency in breakdown of Service between England and Scotland.
Marconi System, Establishment of, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 810.
Underground System.
Extension of, *Oct. 23*, 617.
Furthest point to which wires have been laid, *Oct. 27*, 810.
Telephone Service.
Berlin and London, Unfeasibility of establishing Communication between, *Oct. 23*, 617.
Brussels and London, Date of opening Communication, *Oct. 23*, 617.
Paris and London, Period during which present Rate of Charge has been in force, *Oct. 23*, 616.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary of State for the Colonies* [Birmingham, W.]
Africa, South.
Concentration Camps—Cost of Maintenance since the Termination of the War, *Oct. 28*, 944.
Phthisis, Prevalence among Miners on the Rand, *Oct. 21*, 352.

Chamberlain, Right Hon. J.—*cont.*
Hong Kong Sanitation—Reports of Medical and Sanitary Experts, etc., *Oct. 22*, 469
Transvaal.
Cattle and Live Stock Imports, Regulations, *Oct. 29*, 1071.
Customs Conference, proposed, *Oct. 23*, 608.
Grant of £3,000,000 for re-stocking Boer Farms, etc.
Amount spent—Supplying a rough estimate, *Oct. 23*, 608.
Cost of bringing back Boer prisoners not charged on Fund, *Oct. 27*, 805.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
Sir William Walrond.

Chancellor of the Exchequer
Rt. Hon. C. T. Ritchie.

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northamptonshire, E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 31*, 1362; *Nov. 3*, 1478.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. H. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
Argentine Cattle, Importation of into Great Britain—Opportunity for Discussion prior to Removal of Restrictions, *Oct. 20*, 229.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 31*, 1362.
Parliamentary Procedure—New Rule relating to Order in Debate, Arrangements for completion of during present Session, *Oct. 20*, 221.

Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway Bill
l. Commons Amendts. *con.* Nov. 3*, 1373.

Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway (Consolidated) Bill
c. con. Oct. 16*, 111.
3R.* *Oct. 20*, 202.

Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead (Nos. 1 and 3) Bill
l. Commons Amendts. *con.* Nov. 3*, 1373.

Charing Cross, Euston and Hampstead Railway (No. 2) Bill
l. Commons Amendts. *con.* Nov. 3*, 1373.

Charities
Montgomery, County of—Inquiry into Charities, Report Presented, *Oct. 27*, 793.

Chemical Industries
France—Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17

Cheylesmore, Lord
Sat first in Parliament after the death o his brother, *Nov. 3*, 1373.

Chicago
Consular District Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Chile
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

China
British Military Operations in 1900.
Gratuities for the Forces.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 596.
Rum, Sale of Surplus Stores of Rum—Rule as to supplying Spirits to Soldiers in the Field.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1183.
Hong Kong, *see* that title.
Trade Reports Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17; *Nov. 3*, 1375.
Treaty between Great Britain and China—Copy Presented, *Oct. 20*, 204; *Nov. 3*, 1374.
Wei-hai-wei—Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

China Squadron
Coal—Advantages of New Zealand Coal.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1066.

Chorley
Patent Electric Shot Firing Company's Factory, Explosion at—Report of Inspector Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 18.

Christiania Fishery Conference, 1901
Moray Firth, Closing to Foreign Trawlers, Resolution.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1192.

Churchill, Mr. Winston [Oldham]
Volunteers and Militia, Strength of, *Oct. 30*, 1189.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
Right Hon. G. Wyndham.

Circuit System
Winter Assizes—Copy of Orders in Council Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Cirencester
Board School, Refusal of Admission to Children who had been removed by their Parents from the Church School.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 803.

Civil Servants Superannuation Act
Committee of Inquiry, Constitution of, Terms of Reference, Publication of Report, etc.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1058.

Civil Service
India, Examinations—Regulations Presented, *Oct. 16*, 10, 23.
Pensions and Superannuations.
Appointments without Certificates—Treasury Minutes Presented, *Oct. 16*, 8, 22.
Retired Allowance Granted—Treasury Minute Presented, *Oct. 30*, 1182; *Oct. 31*, 1306.

Civil Service—*cont.*
Pensions and Superannuations—*cont.*
Special Qualifications — Treasury Minutes Presented, *Oct. 16*, 8, 22.

Civil Surgeons
Army Medical Corps, Civil Surgeons attached to, during the South African Campaign—Honours and Emoluments
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1072.

Clark's Siding Remount Farms
see Africa, South—Remount Farms.

Clones
Post Office—Delay in building new Post Office, Complaints of Staff as to Hours of Work, etc.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1060.

Clonmel
Land Appeals — Holding Sittings in Clonmel, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1062.

Cloonacool
Excise Prosecution against P. Henry, Dismissal of Case by Magistrates—Refunding Costs of the Defence proposed.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 825.

Clyde Shipping Company
Subsidy granted by Congested Districts Board, Ireland, for Cork Steamship Service—Refusal of similar subsidy to competing Port of Limerick.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 231.

Coal
Chicago Industry, Consular District Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.
Export Duty—Amount received during present Financial Year up to Sept. 30.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 206.
Navy—China Squadron, Use of New Zealand Coal.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1066.

Cocos Island
Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1376, 1381.

Codification of Laws
Need for Codification, Difficulty of Legislation by reference, etc.
Os. Mr. S. Buxton, *Oct. 21*, 437; Sir A. Rollit, *Oct. 22*, 555; Sir R. Finlay, 556, 557.

Cohen, Mr. B. [Islington, E.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 31*, 1357.

Colomb, Sir J. [Great Yarmouth]
Atlantic Shipping Trust and Cunard Company, Government Agreements with—Laying Papers on the Table of House, *Oct. 17*, 141.
Colonial Conference, Papers relating to, Date of Presentation, *Oct. 17*, 142.

[cont.

Colomb, Sir J.—*cont.*
  Navy—Scouts, Designs and Arrangements for Building, Speed, Armament, and Coal Carrying Capacity, etc., *Nov. 3*, 1383.

Colonial Office
  Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. J. Chamberlain.
  Parliamentary Secretary—Earl of Onslow.

Colonies
  Annual Reports Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17; *Oct. 27*, 792; *Nov. 3*, 1376.
  Conference between Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Prime Ministers of the Self-Governing Colonies.
    Cattle, Importation into Great Britain from the Colonies—Negotiations. *Q. Oct. 21*, 353.
    Paper relating to, Date of Presentation. *Q. Oct. 17*, 142.
    Reports Presented, *Oct. 27*, 792; *Nov. 3*, 1376.
  Statistical Abstract for Years 1887–1901—Copy presented, *Oct. 23*, 592; *Nov. 3*, 1375.
  Statistical Tables for Year 1900 Presented, *Oct. 23*, 592; *Nov. 3*, 1374.

Companies
  Limited Trading Companies—Parliamentary and Municipal Representation, Practice in the Colonies—Laying Information on the Table of the House. *Q. Oct. 22*, 466.

Companies (Winding up) Act
  General Rule Presented, *Oct. 16*, 8, 25.

Compton, Lord A. [Beds., Biggleswade]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 27*, 862.

Concentration Camps in South Africa
  Cost of Maintenance since the War. *Q. Oct. 28*, 944.

Condon, Mr. T. J. [Tipperary, E.]
  Ireland.
    Clonmel Land Appeals—Holding Sittings in Clonmel, proposed, *Oct. 29*, 1062.
    Coercion—Opportunity for Discussion of Irish Grievances, Refusal of Request when made by an Irish Representative, *Oct. 16*, 79.
  Irish Nationalist Parliamentary Party—Objection to the term Section, The Irish were a Party, *Oct. 22*, 485.

Congested Districts, Ireland
  Population, Valuation, etc., 1891–1901—Return Presented, *Oct. 23*, 593.

Congested Districts Board, Ireland
  Coomenaum Slip—Estimates for Slip submitted by Surveyor of the Kerry County Council, Rejection by Congested Districts Board. *Q. Oct. 27*, 818.

Congested Districts Board, Ireland—*cont.*
  Cork Steamship Service, Subsidy granted to the Clyde Shipping Company—Refusal of similar Subsidy to competing Port of Limerick. *Q. Oct. 20*, 231.
  Expenditure—Return proposed. *Q. Oct. 27*, 817.
  Lehud Fishing Harbour, Improvement of—Congested Districts Board contributing towards Cost. *Q. Oct. 23*, 599.
  Number of Acres of Land purchased since January, 1900, etc. *Q. Nov. 3*, 1401.

Congested Districts Board, Scotland
  Expenditure on new Holdings in Crofting Counties since formation of the Board. *Q. Nov. 3*, 1398.
  Lewis, Island of.
    Establishment of Small Holdings Scheme, proposed. *Qs. Oct. 23*, 613; *Oct. 29*, 1075.
    Steamship Subsidy, proposed. *Q. Oct. 28*, 950.
  Swordle, Proposed Fishing Harbour—Refusal of Assistance by Congested Districts Board. *Q. Oct. 30*, 1184.

Congo Free State
  Frontier Delimitation—Seizure by German Force in September, 1900, of portion of Free State, alleged. *Q. Oct. 22*, 470.
    Rabinek, Mr., Arrest of, by Congolese Authorities. *Q. Oct. 27*, 793.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
  Anderson, Sergeant.
    Duties, Nature of, *Oct. 27*, 822.
    Refusal of the Irish Government to dismiss. *Q. Oct. 23*, 627.
      Motion for Adjournment (Mr. S. MacNeill), *Oct.* 23, 633.
  Barracks—Insufficient Accommodation. *Q. Oct.* 21, 351.
  Belfast—Number and Religious Denominations of Force. *Q. Oct. 23*, 600.
  Boyle Union—Extra Force of Constabulary, alleged. *Q. Oct. 28*, 950.
  Castlerea—Extra Force of Constabulary, Number of—Cost, etc. *Q. Oct. 28*, 950.
  Holmes, District Inspector, T. McCloskey's Suit against—Defraying Holmes's Expenses. *Q. Oct. 27*, 823.
  Limerick Public Meeting—Conduct of Constabulary in removing Notices of Meeting. *Q. Oct. 20*, 209.

[*cont.*

Constabulary, Royal Irish—*cont.*
  Newry, Number and Religious Denominations of Force stationed in.
    Q. Oct. 23, 599.
  Promotion, System of.
    Promotion reserved for the Ruffians of the Force, alleged.
      Os. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 20*, 318; Mr. Atkinson, 328.
    System of, grounded on the success of Prosecutions, alleged.
      Q. Oct. 23, 628.
  Sullivan, Sergeant, *see* Sullivan.
  Supervision of P. Meany.
    Q. Oct. 27, 815.

Consumption, *see* Phthisis.

Continuation Classes, Scotland
  Crofting Counties, Number of Classes in—Amount of Grant to be expended.
    Q. Oct. 28, 949.
  Evening Continuation Classes — Delay in Payment of Grant.
    Q. Oct. 30, 1184.

Continuous Brakes
  Railways — Return Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1376, 1380.

Contracts
  M'Connachie Brothers' Contract for supplying Tinned Rations to the Troops in South Africa, Number of Tins rejected — Fair Wage Clause in Contract.
    Q. Oct. 28, 941.

Convicts
  Soldier Convicts, Number in Civil Prisons.
    Q. Oct. 20, 206.

Coomenaum
  Fisheries—Estimates for Slip submitted by Surveyor of the Kerry County Council, Rejection by Congested Districts Board.
    Q. Oct. 27, 818.

Copenhagen
  International Fishery Conference, Publication of Report.
    Q. Oct. 23, 613.

Cork
  Exhibition—Visit of the Chief Secretary, State of the City, Withdrawal of Proclamation proposed.
    Q. Nov. 3, 1401.
  Labourers' Cottages, Rural District Improvement Scheme.
    Delay in Sanction of.
      Q. Oct. 23, 618.
    Refusal to sanction Rural District Council's Scheme.
      Q. Oct. 27, 821.
  Steamship Service—Subsidy to the Clyde Shipping Company granted by Congested Districts Board, Refusal of similar subsidy to competing Port of Limerick.
    Q. Oct. 20, 231.

Corn
  Returns—Separate Returns proposed, distinguishing between Malting and Grinding Barley, etc.
    Q. Oct. 22, 472.

Corn Duty
  Amount received during present financial year up to September 30.
    Q. Oct. 20, 206.
  Calculation by the Quarter or the Hundred-weight.
    Q. Oct. 22, 472.

Cornwall
  Phthisis among Miners, Number of Cases, Number of Deaths since 1895.
    Q. Oct. 29, 1066.

Corofin Case
  Boycotting and Intimidation, Ireland—Evidence of Father O'Donovan.
    O. Mr. Wyndham, *Oct. 27*, 921

Coronation
  Indian Volunteers — Government Employees receiving no Pay for extra period of their detention owing to the King's illness, alleged.
    Q. Oct 22, 462.
  Medals.
    Date of 26th June on Medals—Non-alteration of, on Postponement of the Coronation.
      Q. Oct. 27, 807.
    Silver Medals issued to heads of Municipalities, Number and Cost of.
      Q. Nov. 3, 1395.
    Troops sent home from South Africa for the Coronation—Medal for Regulars not taking part owing to Postponement
      Q. Oct. 22, 468.
  Postmen—Holiday Pay for Auxiliary Postmen in Eastern Central District.
    Q. Oct. 23, 595.

Cosham, Seaman
  Gun Accident at Portsmouth—Inquiry into death of Seaman Cosham.
    Q. Nov. 3, 1383.

Cotton-weaving Sheds
  Standard of Ventilation—Legislation proposed.
    Q. Nov. 3, 1381.

County Court Judges, Ireland
  Cavan and Leitrim Assizes, Presentation of White Gloves to Judges—Withdrawal of Proclamation of Counties, proposed.
    Q. Nov. 3, 1403.
  Curran, Judge, Conduct of, at Mullingar Quarter Sessions in tearing up Resolution passed by Grand Jury requesting withdrawal of Proclamation of County.
    Qs. Oct. 20, 240, 241.

[*cont.*

County Court Judges, Ireland—*cont.*

Difference of Opinion between Judges and Jurors on local matter—Communication from Mr. Wyndham, proposed.
Q. Oct. 20, 241.

Salaries, Submitting to the Criticism of the House, proposed.
Q. Oct. 27, 827.

County Courts (Ireland) Bill

c. 2R.* Bill Withdrawn, *Oct. 20*, 344.

Courts-Martial

Navy—Number of Courts-Martial held and Punishments inflicted in 1901, Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 24; *Nov. 3*, 1374.

Cranborne, Vis. — *Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs* (Rochester)

Cape Guardafui, Establishment of Lighthouse, proposed, *Oct. 29*, 1073.

Christiania Fishery Conference—Resolution as to Closing Moray Firth to Foreign Trawlers, *Oct. 30*, 1193.

Congo Free State, Frontier Delimitation—Seizure by German Force, in September, 1900, of portion of Free State, alleged, *Oct. 22*, 470.

Delagoa Bay — Negotiations to secure British Management for Harbour and Railway, *Nov. 3*, 1394.

Germany and Great Britain, Secret Treaty between, alleged — Communicating Terms to Parliament, *Oct. 22*, 470.

Mediterranean, Maintenance of the *status quo*, H.M. Government Policy applying equally to the Adriatic — Agreement between France and Italy, alleged, *Oct. 23*, 609.

Somaliland—British Military Operations.

Cost to be borne by the British Treasury, *Oct. 28*, 947.

Foreign Office responsibility for conduct of Campaign, *Oct. 20*, 223.

Consultation with the War Office, *Oct. 28*, 947.

Progress of Events, *Oct. 23*, 609; *Oct. 30*, 1190.

Reinforcements, Composition of, *Oct. 20*, 222; *Oct. 23*, 609; *Oct. 28*, 946.

Retirement of Col. Swayne, *Oct. 20*, 222.

Troops—Composition and Number of Troops under the Command of Col. Swayne, *Oct. 28*, 946.

Turkey—Condition of European Turkey, Communications from the Powers to the Porte—Laying on the Table of the House Reports of H.M. Consular Officers in Macedonia, proposed, *Oct. 22*, 471.

Uganda Railway—Laying Balance Sheet on the Table of the House proposed, *Oct. 23*, 609.

Crime

London Central Criminal Court Calendar—Number of Persons charged with Murder, etc.
Q. Oct. 23, 612.

Crimes (Ireland) Acts

Administration of—Revival of Coercion under the Act of 1887, etc.

Administration, Harsh and Partisan Administration of the Act—Proclamation of City of Dublin and nine other Counties.
Motion for Adjournment—
(Mr. W. O'Brien), *Oct. 27*, 830, 890.

Boycotting and Intimidation, Increase in the Cause of Proclamations under Crimes Act, 918.

Inadequacy of reasons given for Proclamation, Crimelessness of Ireland, etc., 895, 900, 929.

Irish Landlords driving the Chief Secretary along the path of Coercion against his better judgment, alleged, 898.

Local Governing Bodies in Ireland—Proclamation an attempt to terrorise, alleged, 902, 907.

"Peace or War?" — Demand for an answer to take back to Ireland, 906, 915, 924.

Political Prisoners, Treatment of—Severity of Sentences given by Coercion Courts, etc., 901, 903, 908, 910, 926, 931.

Unlawful Assemblies, Provisions of the Crimes Act in regard to, 911.

County and District Councillors, Number convicted under terms of Act of 1887 during the past 12 months.
Q. Oct. 23, 619.

Courts, Constitution of Coercion Courts — Number of Courts attended by Mr. Harrell.
Q. Oct. 27, 822.

Hard Labour Sentences.

County and District Councillors, Number sentenced during the past 12 months.
Q. Oct 23, 619.

Disqualification for Service on any Local Body for five years.

Discontinuing infliction of hard labour sentences on Local Representatives, proposed.
Q. Oct. 22, 477.

Kelly's, Mr. P. J., alleged Statement.
Q. Oct. 29, 1063.

[*cont.*

Crimes (Ireland) Acts—*cont.*
  Administration of—*cont.*
    Hard Labour Sentences—*cont.*
      Disqualification for Service—*cont.*
        O'Dwyer, Mr., Sentence—Disqualification as a County Councillor. *Q. Oct. 23*, 624.
      Harris, Mr., Sentence on—Judge Adams's Mitigation of Sentence imposed—Furnishing Copy of Judgment to Resident Magistrates, proposed. *Q. Oct. 27*, 816.
      Instructions given by the Government, alleged. *Qs. Oct. 22*, 481; *Oct. 27*, 818, 819.
      Number of Persons sentenced from November 1901 to present time, etc. *Qs. Oct. 22*, 480.
      Number of Persons sentenced since July 1887 and September 1892. *Qs. Oct. 20*, 236, 238, 239; *Oct. 22*, 480.
      Number of Sentences since Proclamation of certain Counties in April 1902. *Q. Oct. 20*, 236.
    Irish Nationalist Members, Imprisonment of, *see* Irish Nationalist Party.
    O'Flanagan, Mr., Imprisonment of, *see* O'Flanagan.
    Opportunity for Discussion of Irish Grievances — Special Facilities during the Autumn Sitting. *Qs. Oct. 6*, 26; *Oct. 20*, 246; *Oct. 22*, 484.
      O. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Oct. 27*, 928.
      Balfour's, Mr., Statement refusing Special Facilities, *Oct. 16*, 26, 27; *Oct. 20*, 242; *Oct. 22*, 484; *Oct. 23*, 631, 632, 633.
      Debate on the Motion for Precedence of Government Business for the Remainder of the Session, Oct. 16, 38–42, 53–78, 79.
    Peace Preservation Act, *see* that title.
    Prisoners.
      Hard Labour, *see* that sub-heading.
      Treatment of, Political Prisoners subjected to same treatment as ordinary Prisoners, alleged. *Q. Oct. 29*, 1078.
    Proclamations — Papers Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 23.
    Queen's County Proclamation, Freedom from Agrarian Crime, Statistics—Withdrawal of Proclamation proposed. *Qs. Oct. 20*, 209; *Oct. 27*, 823.

Crimes (Ireland) Acts—*cont.*
  Administration of—*cont.*
    Sligo Prison, Number of Prisoners in, under the Act, on April 24 and October 23, 1902. *Q. Oct. 30*, 1195.

Cripps, Mr. C. A. [Lancashire, Stretford]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 28*, 1035; *Oct. 29*, 1117; *Oct. 30* 1268, 1271; *Oct. 31*, 1349.

Crofters and Cottars, Scotland
  Lewis, Island of.
    Number in the Island at time of passing of the Crofters Act. *Q. Oct. 29*, 1075.
    Social condition of the People—Report of the Crofter Commission, Presented, *Oct. 22*, 462; *Nov. 3*, 1374.
  Shetland—Difficulty in obtaining House Sites, Giving Local Authorities Compulsory Powers, proposed. *Q. Nov. 3*, 1398.

Cromarty
  Railway between Dingwall and Cromarty —Progress of Scheme. *Q. Oct. 23*, 610.

Cross, Mr. A. [Glasgow, Camlachie]
  Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *com. Oct. 22*, 566.

Crown Property
  Rating of—Number of Hereditaments held by the Crown for which Treasury Bounties in lieu of Rates are paid, Method of Valuation, etc.—Return. *Qs. Oct. 23*, 614; *Oct. 31*, 1307.

Crucifix
  Westminster Abbey—Erection of Crucifix in Edward the Confessor's Chapel. *Q. Oct. 28*, 949.

Cuba
  Trade Report Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1375.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, South]
  Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, 2R. *Oct. 22*, 552.
  Rolls, Police Constable, Conviction for Perjury at the Central Criminal Court, London—Laying Copies of Shorthand Writer's Report of Trial on the Table of the House proposed, *Oct. 27*, 811.
  Sullivan, Sergeant, Charges against—M'Hale *v.* Sullivan, Laying Shorthand Writer's Report of Civil Action on the Table of the House proposed, *Oct. 27*, 825.

Cunard Company
  Government Agreement with.
    New Liners—Designs to be subject to the approval of the Admiralty, Fitting with Water-tube Boilers, etc. *Q. Nov. 3*, 1392.

[*cont.*

Cunard Company—*cont.*
Government Agreement with—*cont.*
Opportunity for Discussion.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 227.
Papers—Laying on the Table of the House.
Qs. *Oct. 17*, 141; *Oct. 20*, 227, 228.
Subsidy.
Date of first Payment.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 227.
Opportunity for Discussion.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *Oct. 16*, 43; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 52.

Curran, Judge
Administration of the Crimes Act—Submitting Salaries of County Court Judges to the Criticism of the House.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 827.
Boycotting in Ireland—Judge Curran's Preference of serious ordinary Crime to Boycotting.
Q. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 27*, 898.
Mullingar Quarter Sessions, Conduct of Judge Curran in tearing up Resolution passed by Grand Jury requesting withdrawal of Proclamation of County.
Qs. *Oct. 20*, 240, 241.

Curtain, Constable
Sullivan, Sergeant, Charges against—Constable Curtain's Evidence as to falsification of Police Patrol Book, etc.
Q. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 20*, 313.

Customs, Board of
Examining Officers Grievances—Board of Customs Proposals, Date of Communicating Decision to Officers.
Q. *Oct. 24*, 727.

Cyprus
Archbishopric of—Delay in appointing successor to Monsignor Sophronius.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1068.
Court of Justice Amendment Order Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Dairy Products
Adulteration — Proposed International Conference.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 799.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 22*, 561, 563.
Ireland, Condition of—Opportunity for Discussion, Refusal of Special Facilities except on demand of the Opposition, *Oct. 23*, 632.
Local Authorities Bills—Date of taking, *Nov. 3*, 1407
Transvaal Contribution towards the Cost of the War—Date of making announcement as to Amount fixed, *Oct. 20*, 217.

Dardanelles
Arbitration—Settlement of Question by Arbitration, Austrian Premier's alleged Statement.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 359.
Russian Warships, Black Sea Ingress and Egress—Negotiations for opening the Dardanelles to Russian Warships, alleged—H. M. Government's Policy.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 359.

Davies, Mr. A. [Carmarthen Boroughs]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 21*, 372; *Oct. 28*, 977; *Oct. 30*, 1298.

Delagoa Bay
British Management of Harbour and Railway—Negotiations to secure.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1394.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's Co., Ossory]
Ireland.
Barrow Drainage Works — Giving Effect to Recommendations of Commission of 1885, *Oct. 29*, 1063.
Condition of, Revival of Coercion.
British Constitution did not exist in Ireland, *Oct. 16*, 59.
Refusal of Opportunity for Discussion, *Oct. 23*, 633.
Queen's County, Proclamation under Crimes Act — Freedom from Agrarian Crime, Statistics—Withdrawal of Proclamation proposed, *Oct. 20*, 209; *Oct. 27*, 823.
Tullamore Gaol—Treatment of Coercion Prisoners, Number sentenced to hard labour, etc., *Oct. 21*, 355.
Irish Nationalist Members, Imprisonment under the Crimes Act.
Communication to the Speaker, *Oct. 20*, 201; *Oct. 27*, 824.
Member for Birr Division imprisoned for nine days pending Trial, *Oct. 20*, 235.

Denny, Col. [Kilmarnock Burghs]
Indian Railway Contracts for Locomotives placed with German Firms.
Delay in supplying Locomotives, *Oct. 30*, 1191.
Shipment by British Liners, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1382.

Derby, County of
Census—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 21.

Devlin, Mr. J. [Kilkenny, N.]
Belfast.
Disturbance on Custom House Steps.
Devlin's, Mr., Attack on conduct of Mr. Sloan and Col. Saunderson, *Oct. 23*, 638, 687, 694.
Railing in Steps proposed, *Oct. 21*, 356; *Oct. 23*, 624.

[*cont.*

Devlin, Mr. J.—*cont.*
 Belfast—*cont.*
  Orange Institution, Illegal Pressure on Member for South Belfast and Mr. S. Boal—Proclaiming Association, *Oct. 27*, 814.

Devon, County of
 Census—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 21.
 Parliamentary By-Election—New Member sworn for North-Eastern Division, *Oct. 16*, 15.

Devonport, Borough of
 Parliamentary By-Election.
  New Member sworn, *Oct. 27*, 830.
  New Writ, *Oct. 16*, 12.

Devonshire, Duke of
 Autumn Sittings—Adjournment of the House proposed, there being no ordinary Business, *Oct. 16*, 10; *Nov. 3*, 1378.
 Light Load Line Committee, Adjournment of Sittings until next Session proposed, *Oct. 16*, 11.

Dhar
 Ramchandra Rao, Confiscation of Property owing to alleged Complicity in the Indian Mutiny—Claims of the Dewan of Dhar's other descendants.
  Q. *Oct. 23*, 593.

Dickson Poynder, Sir J. [Wilts, Chippenham]
 Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway (New Lines, etc.) Bill, *con.* *Oct. 16*, 110.
 Cavalry—Maximum and Minimum Standards of Height, *Oct. 29*, 1072.
 Piccadilly, City, and North-East London Railways Bill, *re-com.*, *Oct. 29*, 1150, 1152.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. [Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean]
 Army Reserve—Numbers, Effect of New Proposals for re-engagement of Time-expired Men, *Oct. 22*, 469.
 Business of the House.
  Autumn Sittings, Precedence for Government Business — Discussion after Midnight of "Forty Days on the Table" Motions, *Oct. 16*, 26.
  Transvaal Vote—Date of taking, *Nov. 3*, 1406.
  Cirencester Board School, Refusal of Admission to Children whose Parents had removed them from the Church School, *Oct. 27*, 803.
  Congo—Arrest of Mr. Rabinek by Congolese Authorities, *Oct. 27*, 793.
 Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 17*, 170; *Oct. 20*, 298; *Oct. 21*, 399, 414, 512, 548; *Oct 24*, 760, 761; *Oct. 28*, 1051, 1052, 1056; *Oct. 29*, 1086, 1109, 1110; *Oct. 30*, 1198, 1200, 1202, 1205, 1245; *Nov. 3*, 1460.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C.—*cont.*
 Indian Army, Change in Conditions of Service of British Troops—Date of laying before Parliament Papers showing Indian Government Views. *Oct. 20*, 224.
 Navy.
  Fleets of the World, Return—Alteration in Compilation, *Oct. 23*, 604.
  Shipbuilding Programmes for 1901 and 1902—Delay in Commencement of Work, *Oct. 23*, 604.

Dingle
 Harbour—Application for Grant under Provisions of Marine Works (Ireland) Bill—Consideration of Application.
  Q. *Oct. 23*, 620.
 Railway, Grant for Carrying out Alterations recommended by Local Government Board Inspector, proposed.
  Q. *Oct. 23*, 620.

Dingwall
 Barracks, Erection of, during the ensuing year.
  Q. *Oct. 28*, 941.
 Railway between Cromarty and Dingwall—Progress of Scheme.
  Q. *Oct. 23*, 610.

Diseases of Animals.
 Foot and Mouth Disease, *see* that title.
 Order in Council Presented, *Oct. 20*, 204; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Disraeli, Mr. C. R. [Cheshire, Altrincham]
 Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 30*, 1283.

Divisions
 Chairman's Rulings, *see* Lowther.
 Mistake in figures of Closure Division on Education Bill, *Oct. 24*, 774.

Documents
 Indian Government Confidential Documents, Public Sale of—Prevention of Recurrence of Offence.
  Q. *Oct. 20*, 294.

Dogs Regulation Bill
 c. Bill Withdrawn, *Oct. 16*, 136.

Dominica
 Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Donelan, Capt. A. T. C. [Cork, E.]
 Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887—Harsh and Partisan Administration of Act, Prison Treatment of Irish Members, etc., *Oct. 27*, 907.
 King's County, Deprivation of Representation in Parliament through imprisonment of Member, *Oct. 20*, 235.
 Land Purchase Acts (Ireland) Bill, Withdrawal of, *Oct. 20*, 344.

[*cont.*

Donelan, Capt. A. T. C.—*cont.*
National Expenditure, Select Committee on—Appointment of Member, Motion to substitute another Name, proposed, *Oct. 20*, 249.
O'Flanagan, Mr., Imprisonment under Crimes (Ireland) Act—Development of Insanity, Inquiry proposed. *Oct. 20*, 245, *Oct. 22*, 478, 480.

Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Gloucester, Tewkesbury]
Education (England & Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 24*, 736; *Oct. 29*, 1107, 1109.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Kent, St. Augustine's]
Abertysswg Colliery Explosion, Gallantry of Miners—Recognition of, by award of Albert Medal, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1397.
Boer Generals at Cambridge—Disturbances at Meeting addressed by the Generals, *Oct. 28*, 944; *Oct. 30*, 1193.
Coronation Medals.
Date of June 26—Non-alteration of, on postponement of the Coronation, *Oct. 27*, 807.
Silver Coronation Medals issued to heads of Municipalities, Number and Cost of, *Nov. 3*, 1395.
Police, Offence of Perjury—Sentence passed on Ex-Police Constable Rolls, Witnesses for the Prosecution, etc. *Oct. 23*, 611, 612.
Prayer Book—Alterations from the Authorised Text in recent Edition, *Oct. 27*, 808.
Presbyterian Church, Ireland, Precedence of the Moderator of the General Assembly, *Oct. 23*, 629.
Vaccination Exemption Certificates—Mr. J. F. Back refused Certificate and subsequently imprisoned for being without one, *Oct. 21*, 354.
Workmen's Compensation Act—Medical Referee acting as Medical Witness, Case of Pearl *v.* Furness, *Nov. 3*, 1395.

Down, County
Court House, Use of, for Political Meetings—Instructions to High Sheriff.
Q. Oct. 23, 623.

Drainage Works, Ireland
Barrow River—Giving effect to Recommendations of Commission of 1885.
Q. Oct. 29, 1063.

"Drayton Grange" Transport
Overcrowding, etc.—Inquiry.
Date of laying Report on the Table of the House.
Q. Oct. 27, 802.
Information from Colonial Authorities, Laying on the Table, proposed.
Q. Nov. 3, 1387.

Dublin
Constabulary—Lack of Barrack Accommodation.
Q. Oct. 21, 351.
Custom House—Nuns begging for Alms on Pay Day, Abolishing Practice, Public Right of Entry.
Q. Oct 30, 1194, 1195.
Phœnix Park, Rateability of Grazing Rents—Treasury Contributions.
Q. Oct. 23, 614, 615.
Proclamation of.
Reason for.
Q. Oct. 27, 814, 815.
see also Crimes (Ireland) Acts, Administration.
Soldiers stationed in, Lack of Barrack Accommodation.
Q. Oct. 21, 351.

Duke, Mr. H. E. [Plymouth]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 20*, 290; *Oct. 28*, 1005.

Dumbarton Corporation [Further Powers] Order Confirmation Bill
c. 1R.* *Oct. 17*, 137.
*con.** *Oct. 20*, 202.
3R.* *Oct. 22*, 461.
l. 1R.* *Nov. 3*, 1373.

Duncan, Mr. J. H. [Yorks, W.R., Otley]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 22*, 496.

Dutch Guinea
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2.

Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H. [Kent, Dartford]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 16*, 126; *Oct. 20*, 298; *Oct. 24*, 740, 741; *Oct. 28*, 1007.
South-Eastern and London, Chatham and Dover Railway Bill, Lords Amendments, *Oct. 16*, 105.

East India
see India.

Edgware and Hampstead Railway Bill
c. 3R. *Oct. 16*, 109.
l. Commons Amendts. *con.** *Nov. 3*, 1373.

Education
President of the Board of Education—Marquess of Londonderry.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education—Sir W. Anson.
Army Schools—Provision of Adequate Supply of Teachers, Religious Instruction, etc.
Q. Oct. 22, 468.
Building Rules.
Disappearance of from the Code—Revision of Rules.
Qs. Lord E. Fitzmaurice, Sir W. Anson, *Oct. 17*, 182; Dr. Macnamara, Sir W. Anson, *Oct. 20*, 283.
Rules Presented, *Oct. 28*, 839.

[*cont.*

Education—*cont.*
- Elementary School Teachers' Deferred Annuity Fund—Date of Circular of Accounts.
  - *Q. Oct. 29*, 1062.
- Exclusion of Children from Cirencester Board School—Arrangement between School Board and Managers of Voluntary School forbidding Capricious Migration from School to School.
  - *Q. Oct. 27*, 803.
- Grants.
  - Building Grants to Public Elementary Schools — Statement Presented, *Oct. 30*, 1182 ; *Nov. 3*, 1375.
  - Grants paid to School Boards under Section 97, Elementary Education Act of 1870 Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 20.
- Ireland.
  - Appendix to Report of Commissioners for 1901, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 8, 23.
  - Intermediate Education—Additional Rule Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 23.
  - Swords Borough School Scholarship, M. Keegan disqualified by Examiners—Referring matter to National Board of Education.
    - *Q. Oct. 29*, 1077.
- Museums, Colleges and Institutions—Report for 1901 Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 20.
- Sanitation — Cleansing, Lighting, etc., Standard of—Issue of Memorandum by the Board of Education, proposed.
  - *Os.* Dr. Macnamara, Sir W. Anson, *Oct. 29*, 1093.
- Schools—Lists of Schools under Administration of the Board of Education Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 20.
- Scotland.
  - Continuation Classes.
    - Crofting Counties, Number of Classes in, Amount of Grant to be expended.
      - *Q. Oct. 28*, 949.
    - Grants, Delay in payment of.
      - *Q. Oct. 30*, 1184.
  - Fuel for Schoolroom Fires—Circular issued by Scottish Education Department abolishing Custom of Children providing Peats for Class-room fires, Disregard of, in Isle of Lewis.
    - *Q. Oct. 21*, 354.
- Secondary and Technical Education, *see* that title.
- Spalding Grammar School—Recognition of, as Secondary School.
  - *Q. Nov. 3*, 1390.
- Voluntary Schools, *see* titles Education (England and Wales) Bill, and Voluntary Schools.

Education, Board of
- Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 21.
- President.
  - Appointment of the Marquess of Londonderry, Criticism of.
    - *O.* Mr. S. Evans, *Oct. 21*, 403.
  - Salary—Method of providing during Current Financial Year.
    - *Q. Oct. 20*, 220.

Education [England and Wales] Bill.
- *c. com. Oct. 16*, 97, 111 ; *Oct. 17*, 142 ; *Oct. 20*, 253 ; *Oct. 21*, 360 ; *Oct. 22*, 492 ; *Oct. 23*, 639, 705 ; *Oct. 24*, 728 ; *Oct. 27*, 831 ; *Oct. 28*, 951 ; *Oct. 29*, 1079, 1156 ; *Oct. 30*, 1197 ; *Oct. 31*, 1311.
  - *Nov. 3*, 1408.

Education (England and Wales) Bill
- Amendments to Clause 8 needful to bring its provisions into harmony with Mr. Balfour's Statements at Manchester—Date of placing on the Notice Paper.
  - *Q. Oct. 21*, 358.
- Autumn Sittings, Appropriation for discussion of a Bill which nobody wanted and for which the Government had no mandate.
  - Lloyd-George, Mr., on, *Oct. 16*, 43.
- *Debate in Committee* (Commons) *Oct. 16*, 97, 111 ; *Oct. 17*, 142 ; *Oct. 20*, 253 ; *Oct. 21*, 361 ; *Oct. 22*, 492 ; *Oct. 23*, 639 ; *Oct. 24*, 728 ; *Oct. 27*, 831 ; *Oct. 28*, 951 ; *Oct. 29*, 1079 ; *Oct. 30*, 1197 ; *Oct. 31*, 1311 ; *Nov. 3*, 1408.
  - Appeal to the Board of Education in case of dispute between the School Management and the Board of Education, 166, 167, 191, 285, 287, 501, 502, 504, 1365.
    - Abolition of the Right of Appeal proposed, 385-404, 1225-1250.
    - Additional Requirements by the Local Authority from time to time, 411.
    - Alternative proposed — Appeal from the Managers to the Education Committee and from the Education Committee to the County or Borough Council, 1243.
    - Books, Choice of, 415.
    - Courts of Law, Objections to ventilating Educational Disputes in, 1229, 1239.
    - Encouragement of Managers to set up their authority against the Local Education Authority, 511.
    - Limits of the Appeal, 391, 394, 398, 506, 507, 516.
    - Repair of School Buildings, 400, 1133, 1241.
    - Requirements of Local Authority, Question of Appeal on Questions of Compliance, Reasonable or Unreasonable Demands, etc., 401, 644, 1240.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate in Committee—cont.*
  - Appeal to the Board of Education—*cont.*
    - School Provision, Right of Appeal by Ten Ratepayers, 1446.
      - Abolition of proposed Right of Appeal, 1469.
      - Majority of Ratepayers, Substituting for the Limit of Ten Ratepayers, 1471–1479.
    - Secular Instruction, Right of Appeal created for the purpose of fettering the Education Authority, alleged, 402.
    - Teachers, Dismissal of, 887, 957, 970.
    - Working of the Right of Appeal in the case of sub-Clauses to Clause 8, 1230.
  - Audit of Accounts, *see* sub-heading Finance.
  - Board of Education.
    - Appeal, *see* that sub-heading.
    - Efficiency of Schools—Board of Education as the judge of Efficiency, 176–184.
    - Expenditure, Right of the Board to impose conditions or restrictions, 297.
    - Necessary Schools—Board of Education the supreme authority to decide what was necessary—Discretionary Power for Local Education Authority, proposed, 190–198.
    - Structural suitability of Schools, Requirement not enforced under existing system, 280.
    - Unfair Discrimination by the Local Education Authority, Power to withold the Grant a check on, 166.
  - Books, Purchase of—Use of particular Books, etc.
    - Religious Instruction—Distinction between purchase of books by the Local Authority for instruction under the Cowper-Temple Clause and expenditure for sectarian purposes, 189.
    - Secular Education, Power as to selection, etc., rested with the Education Authority and not with the Management, 411, 414, 415, 417–420.
  - Caretaker of Schools, Authority responsible for Wages, 1102.
  - Centralizing Bill, alleged, 393.
  - Church Atmosphere wanted in Elementary Schools, alleged, 147, 266, 270.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate in Committee—cont.*
  - Clause 8.
    - Amendments promised before the Adjournment not yet placed on the Paper, 97.
    - Postponement of, proposed, 111.
  - Clause 9, Postponement of, proposed, 1408.
  - Compensation for School Buildings in cases where Managers failed to comply with requirements, 1130, 1138, 1263–1276.
  - Control — Popular Control by the Local Education Authority as representing the Ratepayers.
      - County Councils, Attitude of, and fitness for the work which it was proposed to impose on them, 144, 149, 150, 152, 155, 157, 158, 182.
      - Welsh County Councils—Possibility of Welsh Councils using Powers given for Secular Education in order to destroy Religious education, 417–421.
    - Details, Arrangement of.
      - Giving some General Power proposed, in order that Details might be settled either by the Managers or by the Local Education Authority, 537, 547, 648, 650.
      - List of Specific Powers either in Clause 8 or in the Schedule proposed, 647–651.
      - Matter of Arrangement between the Local Authority and the Managers, 1103.
    - Financial Control, Question of Delegating Powers by Local Education Authority to the Managers, 295, 768, 771.
    - Functions of Managers, Relations with Local Authority, etc., 146, 174, 295–300, 376–382, 498–522.
      - Act of 1870, Position of Managers under, 499, 514.
      - Cumbrous, Inconvenient System — Criticism of the Government Proposals, 508.
      - Definition of Powers of Managers, Lack of, in the Bill, 376, 377, 498, 514, 515, 535, 1366.
      - Economic Administration, Difficulty of enforcing on Managers, 511.
      - London School Board System—Illustration used in Mr. A. J. Balfour's Speech at Manchester, 111, 112, 113, 120, 122, 124, 126, 128, 255.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate in Committee—cont.*
  - Control—*cont.*
    - Functions of Managers—*cont.*
      - Quasi-independent Position granted to Managers, 120, 509.
      - School Buildings, Control of, Repairs, etc., *see* sub-heading School Buildings.
      - Secular Education, Views of the Local Authority to be carried out by Managers representing the Local Education Authority, proposed, 498–522.
    - Maintenance and Efficiency of Elementary Schools, *see* sub-headings School Buildings and Maintenance.
    - "Managers" and "Management"—Terms which did not carry the idea of Control, alleged, 113, 114, 115, 121, 129.
    - Obedience to Instructions, No Power to enforce, under the Bill, 151, 157, 396, 510.
    - Policy of giving the Central Authority control over the Local Authority, 398.
    - Powers of Education Authority over Managers, No provision in the Bill stating general powers, 116.
    - Provided and Non-provided schools, Control of Local Education Authority equally complete, but not the same, because the Foundation Managers could not be dismissed, 516.
    - Secular Education controlled by the Local Education Authority and not by the Managers, 114, 121, 123, 126, 128, 130, 146, 172, 389.
      - Extent of Popular Control, 160.
      - Supremacy of Local Education Authority in all matters relating to the Management of the School other than Religious Instruction, proposed, 534.
    - Subjects lying between the Secular and Religious Spheres, Control of, 517, 533–540.
    - Teachers, Appointment and Dismissal, etc., *see* sub-heading Teachers.
    - Voluntary Schools, Control of—Education Authority possessed of the power of the purse, 123, 127, 157.
    - *see* also sub-heading Managers and Management.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate in Committee—cont.*
  - County Councils, Attitude of, and Fitness for the work which it was proposed to impose on them, 144, 149, 150, 152, 155, 157, 158, 182.
    - Welsh County Councils.—Possibility of Welsh Councils using powers given with regard to Secular Education, in order to destroy Religious Education, 417.
  - Cowper-Temple Clause, *see* sub-heading Religious Instruction.
  - Dancing, Classification of, as Secular or Religious Instruction, 412.
  - Details, Control of, *see* sub-heading Control.
  - Disputes—Parties to a Dispute, Lack of Definition in the Bill, 193.
  - Education Committee—Inspection of Schools, Right of Entry for individual members of the Education Committee, 717.
  - Educational Appliances, *see* sub-headings Books, and Furniture and Apparatus.
  - Efficiency of Elementary Schools, *see* sub-heading Maintenance and Efficiency.
  - Elections, Meetings in connection with—Use of Schools, 1198, 1212.
  - Elementary School, Definition of, 375.
  - Endowments.
    - Disposal of—Position of Local Education Authority and Managers, 1083, 1085, 1087.
    - History of—Church of England possessed of Endowments which the founders never intended to give, 1081.
    - Misapplication of Endowments—Money left to the Poor devoted to Secondary Education, 1086–1088.
    - Position of Endowed Schools under the Compulsory Rate Aid Proposal, 258.
    - Repairs and Buildings Fund, Appropriation of Income from Endowment, proposed, 1055, 1080–1089.
    - Restriction of Endowments to the particular area which they were originally intended to benefit, 1084, 1086, 1089.
    - Trust Deeds, *see* that sub-heading
  - Evening use of School Buildings.
    - Authority controlling, 414–422.
    - Rent Free for Educational Purposes, 1045.
    - Rooms used by the Managers to be left in a proper condition for school purposes, 1160–1168.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*

- *Debate in Committee—cont.*
  - Finance of the Bill—Control of Expenditure in Voluntary Schools, etc.
    - Appropriation, Substituting for the word Control or inserting in addition to it, proposed, 175.
    - Audit of Accounts.
      - Character of — Subjecting Accounts to the audit of the Local Government Board, Local Audit, etc. 759–771.
      - Only Control exercised by the Local Education Authority, alleged, 117, 118.
    - Board of Education, Right of imposing Conditions or Restrictions as to Expenditure, 297.
    - Books, Purchase of, for Religious Instruction—Distinction between purchase of Books by the Local Education Authority for instruction under the Cowper-Temple Clause and expenditure for sectarian purposes, 187.
    - Building Repairs, Expenditure for, to be provided by the managers, 174, 182.
    - Caretaker's Wages, Authority responsible for, 1102.
    - Delegation of Financial Control by Local Education Authority to Managers, Question of, 295, 300.
    - Local Education Authority to have control of all expenditure other than that for which provision is made by the Managers, proposed, 294.
      - Discrimination between Secular and Denominational Expenditure, 173.
      - Sole Control for Local Education Authority, proposed. Managers' unlimited right of spending money under the Bill as it stood, 171-176, 295-300.
    - Managers' Financial Liabilities, *see* sub-heading Managers.
    - Optional instead of Compulsory Rate aid for Voluntary Schools, proposed, 255–274.
      - Cost of Annual Maintenance of Schools to be borne by the individual parish, 258.
    - Salaries of Teachers, *see* sub-heading Teachers.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*

- *Debate in Committee—cont.*
  - Finance of the Bill—*cont.*
    - Secular Education, Financial Responsibility of Local Education Authority restricted to, proposed, 187-190.
    - *see* also sub-heading Rates.
  - Furniture.
    - Damage to Furniture.
      - Appeal, Question of, 1233, 1237.
      - Liability of Managers in respect of the use by them of the School Furniture out of School Hours, 1160.
    - Existing Furniture and Apparatus, Powers of Managers to remove the Furniture, or to require the Local Authority to purchase it, 1105-1109.
    - Provision of, by the Managers, proposed, 1104-1109.
    - Secular Education, Power rested with the Education Authority and not with the Management, 411.
  - Grants to Voluntary Schools—Parliamentary Grant to be withheld in case of Managers' Failure to comply with Local Authority's Requirements, 1225.
    - Check on Unfair Discrimination, 258.
  - Grouping of Parishes for Educational purposes, Unpopularity of such a Course, 258.
  - Heating and Lighting Apparatus of Schools—Apparatus to be provided by the Managers, Fuel and Lighting by the Local Authority 1123.
  - Holidays, Control of.
    - Local Education Authority to have power to regulate Opening and Closing of Voluntary Schools, proposed, 645–651.
    - Omission from the Bill, 535.
  - Inspection of Schools by the Local Education Authority.
    - Individual Members of the Local Authority and Education Committee, Right to inspect Schools, 717–724.
    - Periodical Inspection, proposed, 706–714.
    - Reports as to State and Efficiency of the Schools, Annual Presentation to the Education Department, 755.
  - Insurance of School Buildings against Fire, Making Insurance by Managers compulsory, proposed, 1094.
  - Lighting of Schools, Responsibility for, 1123.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate in Committee—cont.*
  - Local Education Authority, Powers of.
    - Additional Requirements, Power of laying down new Conditions in future, proposed, 409–422.
    - Delegation of Financial Control to Managers, Question of, 295.
    - *Mandamus*—Remedy provided in case of failure in duty on the part of the Local Authority.
      - Act of 1870 Precedent, 170, 171.
      - Ineffective Machinery — Inapplicable to circumstances that would arise under the Bill, etc., 159, 168, 170, 171.
    - *see also* sub-headings, Control, Maintenance, School Accommodation, etc.
  - London School Board Relations with Managers of Board Schools—Mr. A. J. Balfour's Illustration of the proposed relations between Managers of Voluntary Schools and the Local Education Authority, 111, 112, 113, 120, 122, 124, 126, 128, 255.
  - Maintenance and Efficiency of Elementary Schools within the jurisdiction of the Local Education Authority.
    - Additional Requirements, Powers of Local Authority to lay down new Conditions from time to time, proposed, 409–422.
      - Proviso that the Conditions should concern matters not relating solely to Religious Instruction, 413.
    - Agent to carry out directions with reference to Secular Education, Manager or Managers representing the Education Authority, proposed, 498–522.
    - Compliance with Requirements of Local Authority.
      - Appeal to the Board of Education, Abolition of right of Appeal, proposed, 385–404.
      - Condition Precedent to Maintenance, 375–382, 642.
      - Repairs, Standard of, 1123.
    - Equal Treatment for Provided and Non-Provided Schools, 163–170.
      - Education Department's power to withhold the Grant a sufficient check on Unfair Discrimination, 166.
    - Failure of Managers to comply with Requirements of Local Authority.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate in Committee—cont.*
  - Maintenance and Efficiency—*cont.*
      - Power of Local Authority to carry out the direction as if they were the Managers, 669, 674–680, 1131–1138.
      - Rate-Aid and Parliamentary Grant to be withheld, 1226.
      - Supersession of Defaulting Managers proposed, 639–644, 667–673.
    - Option of Local Authority in Selection of Schools, proposed, 144–162.
    - School Buildings, *see* that sub-heading.
    - Secular Education, Financial Responsibility of Local Education Authority restricted to, proposed, 187, 190.
    - Standard of Efficiency—Definition of Efficiency wanted, Board of Education to determine the Standard, etc., 167, 176–184.
      - Board of Education overlooking inefficient Condition of Voluntary Schools under existing system, 180, 181, 184.
  - Managers and Management of Voluntary Schools.
    - Board of Management, Constitution of, 738.
    - Financial Liabilities of Managers in Connection with the School existing at the passing of the Act, Responsibility for, 1095–1100.
    - Managers prohibited from Expenditure of Public Money unless authorised by the Local Authority.
    - Repairs of School Buildings, *see* Sub-heading School Buildings.
    - Interpretation of, as not carrying any idea of Control—Expressions giving opportunity for misrepresentation, etc., 113, 114, 115, 121, 129, 147.
    - Meetings and Minutes of Proceedings—Prescribing Minimum Number of Meetings, and requiring Record of Proceedings, proposed, 543–549.
    - Teachers, Appointment and Dismissal, etc., *see* sub-heading Teachers.
    - Two Classes of Managers, 377,509.
    - *see also* sub-headings Maintenance, School Buildings, etc.
  - *Mandamus*—Remedy provided in case of Failure in Duty on the part of the Local Authority
    - Act of 1870, Precedent, 170–171.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
Mandamus—cont.
Ineffective Machinery—Inapplicable to circumstances that would arise under the Bill, etc., 159, 168, 170, 171.
Meetings.
Managers' Meetings, Prescribing Minimum Number, 543—549.
Political Meetings, Use of Schools for, 1198—1212.
Minutes of Managing Committee, Inspection, Right of, 729.
Requiring a Record of Proceedings, 543.
Necessary Schools.
Definition of a School already in Existence, 1440, 1441, 1490, 1496.
Discretionary Power for Local Authority to decide what was necessary, proposed—Board of Education the Supreme Authority under the Bill, 190.
Nonconformist Grievances.
Rates, Expressed Intention of Nonconformists to refuse Payment if the Bill became Law, 152, 268, 270, 271.
Single School Grievance done away with by the right to provide New Schools under the Bill, 1438, 1497.
Teachers, Appointment of, 834, 841.
Assistant Teachers and Pupil Teachers, Appointment without reference to Religious Creed or Denomination notwithstanding anything in the Trust Deed of a Non-provided School, 979—994, *see* also *Erratum*.
Opposition to the Bill—Agitation in the Country, Nonconformist Attitude, etc., 152.
Pictures for School-rooms, Choice of, Authority Controlling, 538.
Political Meetings, Use of Schools for, 1198—1212.
Popular Control, *see* sub-heading Control.
Prizes and Certificates, Authority Controlling Grant of, 535, 537.
Progress, Motion to Report, 783.
Provision of Schools, *see* sub-heading School Accommodation.
Rates.
Agricultural Rating Act, Relief resulting from, almost entirely done away with by the proposed Education Rate, 264.
Discrimination between Rates and Taxes, 265, 269.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
Rates—*cont.*
Nonconformist expressed intention to refuse payment if the Bill became law, 152, 268, 270, 271.
Religious Instruction.
Additional Requirements from time to time, Powers for Local Authority, proposed—Denominational Character of Denominational Schools threatened, 410–413.
Appeals, Probability of, 1225.
Books, Purchase of — Distinction between purchase of Books by the Local Authority for Instruction under the Cowper-Temple Clause and Expenditure for Sectarian Purposes, 189.
Church Atmosphere wanted, alleged, 1447, 266, 270.
Control of, by the Managers, 675, 676.
Religious Instruction to be in accordance with the Tenour of the Trust Deeds—Effect on Status of the Clergyman, Giving Local Representative Managers a voice in Denominational Instruction, etc., 1311–1358.
Cowper-Temple Clause.
Administration of—Harsh Administration, Difficulty in Single School Areas, 733, 734, 742.
Complaints under—Power for the Local Authority to investigate and adjudicate upon infractions of the Conscience Clause, or to represent Matters to the Board of Education, 730–750.
Satisfactory form of Religious Instruction under — Facilities for those desiring different methods, 364.
Sheet-Anchor of Religious Education, 1431, 1433.
Denominational Teaching at certain hours by Teachers selected for the purpose, 847.
Inspection of, where required by the Trust Deed, 1317.
Managers, Supersession of.
Interference with Control of Religious Education, 640 641.
Non-Compliance with Conditions respecting Religious Instruction, 1157

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
Religious Instruction—*cont.*
Nonconformist Churches, Consulting Representatives, proposed, 373.
Nonconformist Conscience dormant for thirty years, 863, 869, 871.
Proselytising was the result of the Denominational System, 1491–1495, 1498.
Reasonable Facilities—Directions given by the Local Authority shall not be such as to interfere with Reasonable Facilities for Religious Instruction, 661–665.
Religious Difficulty existed only in the House of Commons and not in the Schools, alleged, 990, 1432, 1442, 1445.
Scottish System *v.* the Cowper-Temple Clause, 1425, 1440, 1442, 1448, 1451, 1499.
Separate Facilities—Permitting each Denomination to give its own teaching, the only System that could ultimately prevail in view of Religious Differences, 370, 663.
Trust Deeds, Religious Instruction to be in accordance with the tenour of, and to be under the control of the Managers—Effect on Status of the Clergyman in his own Parish, Giving Local Representative Managers a voice in Denominational Instruction, etc., 1311–1358.
Unsectarian Teaching based on the reading of the Bible to form part of the regular Instruction of School, proposed, 361–373.
Visitation, System of, proposed, 1331.
Welsh County Councils—Possibility of using powers given for Secular Education in order to destroy Religious Education, 417–421.
Religious Tests for Teachers.
Abolition of Religious Tests for Assistant Teachers and Pupil Teachers, 979–994.
Disability imposed upon the Teaching Profession and Obstruction to the Progress of Education, 839–841, 849, 851, 854, 859, 860, 862, 868, 872, 873 1363.
Itinerant Teachers, Case of, 994.
Religious Worship, Opening and Closing Schools with, proposed, 361, 363, 367.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
Rent, Payment of, for use of Schools by the Local Authority, proposed, 869, 870.
Rent-Free Premises — Managers of Voluntary Schools to provide School-house free of charge, with the exception of the Teacher's Dwelling-house, if any, 1021–1055.
All Buildings and other Hereditaments usually occupied or enjoyed, together with the School-house, Inclusion of, 1026.
Teacher's Dwelling-house, Exception from Rent-free Proviso *see* sub-heading Teachers.
Use of School Premises rent-free, at times outside the hours devoted to Elementary Education.
Free for all Educational Purposes, 1045.
Three Days a Week for other Educational Purposes, if the Local Education Authority have no other suitable Accommodation, 1047–1055.
Repair of School Buildings, *see* sub-heading School Buildings.
Reports of Inspectors as to State and Efficiency of the Schools, Annual Presentation, proposed, 755.
Roman Catholic Schools.
Religious Instruction, Control of, by the whole body of Managers—Position of Roman Catholics, 1324, 1336, 1339, 1343.
Teachers, Appointment of—Separate Treatment for Roman Catholic Schools, 841, 858.
Rural Districts—Benefit of Larger Schools, Collection of Pupils by Public Conveyance, etc., 192, 196.
School Accommodation.
Building Fund, Creation of, proposed, 1409.
Enlargement of existing Public Elementary Schools, Obligation of Owners, etc. to go through the process of Appeal and Investigation, 1459.
Necessary Schools, Discretionary power for Local Education Authority to decide what was necessary, proposed—Board of Education the supreme Authority under the Bill, 190–198.
Provision of New Schools—Right of Local Education Authority or any other Persons to initiate New School Accommodation under the Bill.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
School Accommodation—*cont.*
Provision of New Schools—*cont.*
Act of 1870, Shortcomings of, 1434, 1451.
Appeal, Right of, by Ten Ratepayers, 1446, 1469–1479.
Competition between Local Education Authority and Private Persons to be deprecated—Making Local Authority Arbitrator in case of Dispute, 1415.
Delay occasioned by allowing Provision by Persons other than the Local Authority, 1437.
Grounds for supplying Additional School Places—Objections to the Religious Basis under the Bill, Retention of Educational Deficiency as the only ground, 1487–1500.
Local Education Authority to have the sole right of providing New Schools, 1421–1456.
Multiplication of Small Schools, Evils of, 1429, 1434, 1444, 1449, 1453, 1490.
Nonconformist Grievance of the Single School done away with, 1438, 1497.
School already in Existence, Definition of, 1440, 1441, 1490, 1496.
Rural Districts, Benefit of Larger Schools, Collection of pupils by Public Conveyance, etc., 192, 196.
School Buildings.
Alterations and Improvements.
Appeal Question, 1233, 1237.
Loans—Proposals of the Bill of 1896, 1134, 1136.
Local Education Authority, Right to carry out Improvements if the Managers were unable or unwilling to meet Requirements, 1131–1138.
"Reasonably" — Omission of limitation in reference to the Local Authority's requirements, 1125.
Buildings leased to School Boards and maintained by them under existing system, Authority to Settle Questions in event of Disputes, 513.
Compulsory Purchase by the Local Authority, or Acquisition for Rent, in cases where the Managers failed to comply with Requirements, 1263–76.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Debate in Committee—cont.
School Buildings—*cont.*
Control of Buildings during School Hours and after School Hours, Relations between Local Authority and Managers, Right to use of Schools in the Evening, 413–422.
Damage to Schoolrooms, etc., when in use for Educational purposes out of School Hours, Liability of Local Authority, 1160.
Definition of "School-house" in the Act of 1870, and under the Bill, 1022, 1024, 1026.
Insurance against Fire, Making Insurance by Managers compulsory, proposed, 1094.
Rent-free Premises, *see* that sub-heading.
Repair of Buildings.
Amount to be provided by the Managers, Proposal for an average of 7s. per child, 1091, 1093.
Appeal in case of Dispute between Local Authority and Managers, Question of, 400, 1133, 1241.
Definition needed of term "Repairs," 1093.
Expenditure for which provision is to be made by the Managers, 174, 182.
Failure of Managers to meet requirements, Right of Local Authority to carry out Repairs, 1131–1138.
Foundation Managers, Specification of, in order to protect the Local Managers from any Financial Responsibility, 1089.
Funds for Repairs—Specification of Resources, Subscriptions, Donations, Income from Endowment, or other, 1055, 1080–1089.
Limitation of Managers' Liability to Structural Repairs, 1110–1120.
Loans—Proposals of Bill of 1896, 1134, 1136.
Local Education Authority, Discretionary Power to contribute in respect of Repairs other than Structural, 1115.
Managers not under any Personal Liability to provide Funds, 1084.
Rooms used by the Managers out of School Hours to be left in a proper condition for School purposes, 1160.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate in Committee—cont.*
  - School Buildings—*cont.*
    - Rules, Disappearance from the Code—Revision of Rules, 182, 283.
    - Standard of Sanitation, Cleansing, Lighting, etc.—Issue of Memorandum by the Board of Education, proposed, 1093.
    - Structural Suitability.
      - Board of Education not enforcing requirement — Conspiracy of Silence among Inspectors, 280, 1274.
      - Condition Precedent to Transfer of Schools to the Local Education Authority, proposed, 277–292.
      - Consequences in case of Non-compliance with Local Education Authority's Instructions, 287, 288, 290, 1134, 1135.
      - Local Education Authority, Power to make Alterations if the Managers were unable or unwilling to meet requirements, proposed, 286.
      - Standard of Efficiency of School, Including Structural Suitability, proposed, 177.
  - Subscriptions to Voluntary Schools—Appropriation of to the Repairs and Buildings Fund, proposed, 1055, 1080, 1088,
  - Teachers, Appointment and Dismissal, etc. — Relations between Managers of Voluntary Schools, and the Local Education Authority.
    - Appeal with reference to Appointment or Dismissal, Question of, 112, 114, 843, 957, 970.
    - Appointment of Teachers by the Managers — Local Education Authority's Consent to be required, and not to be withheld except on Educational grounds, 116.
      - Assistant Teachers, Appointment by the Local Authority in cases where there are more Candidates than Posts to be filled, 1277–1300.
      - Assistant Teachers and Pupil Teachers, Appointment without reference to Religious Creed or Denomination, notwithstanding anything in the Trust Deed of a non-provided School, 979–994.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate in Committee—cont.*
  - Teachers—*cont.*
    - Appointment of Teachers—*cont.*
      - Consent of Local Authority—Objections to the limitation "Educational Grounds," Definition of "Educational Grounds," etc., 954–959, 962, 963.
      - Denominational Character of the School only retained by leaving Appointment of Teachers to the Managers, alleged, 836, 837, 842, 846, 853, 856.
      - Difficulties of Managers in Selection of Teachers, 867.
      - Direct Appointment by the Local Education Authority, proposed, 831–876.
      - Dual Control, Working of System, 838, 848.
      - Foundation Managers and Managers representing the Local Authority would all act together, notwithstanding difference of function, 960.
      - London School Board System, 865, 875.
      - Managers' Powers as to, 296, 299, 377, 379, 380, 505, 519.
      - Nonconformist Grievances, 834, 841, 852, 866, 1285, 1289, 1294.
      - Qualifications other than Educational, Demand for, in Voluntary Schools, 871, 873, 959.
      - Roman Catholic Schools, Separate Treatment for, 841, 858, 958, 959.
      - Status of Teacher, Effect of Appointment by Managers, 839.
      - "Teachers" — Inclusion of Assistant Teachers and Pupil Teachers, 1281.
      - Testimonials and selected Candidate, Inspection before confirming Appointment — Powers of Local Education Authority, 959, 960, 962, 964.
      - Trust Deeds giving Power of Appointment to the Clergyman—Insertion of words in the Bill to make it clear that the Managers had the Right of Appointment, 951.
    - Dismissal of Teachers.
      - Conscience Clause, Infraction of, as an "Educational ground" for dismissal of Teachers, 738, 739.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*

Debate in Committee—cont.

Teachers—*cont.*

Dismissal of Teachers—*cont.*

Consent of the Local Authority to be required unless the Dismissal be on grounds connected with the giving of Religious Instruction, 884–890, 967–977.

Local Education Authority Powers as to, 114, 516, 652, 655, 956, 957.

Teachers in Denominational School Buildings which had been leased to School Boards, Position of, 972.

Duties—Extraneous Duties.

Demand for Qualifications other than Educational, 871, 873, 959, 999.

Regulation of Duties by the Local Authority, 654.

Ultra vires for the Managers to make performance of non-scholastic duties a condition of the Teacher's Employment — Insertion of provision either in the Bill or in the Education Code, 997–1010.

Dwelling-house for the Teacher, if any — Payment of Rent by the Local Authority, 1021–1042.

Application of Rent received, 1033, 1040, 1080.

Omission of the provision proposed, 1035.

Option of Local Authority to take the house, 1023, 1040.

Salary of Teachers, Denominational Contribution by transferring Dwelling-houses to the Local Authority rent free, 1029, 1031, 1035.

Number and Educational Qualifications, Control by Local Education Authority, 651.

Promotion of Teachers, Powers of Local Education Authority, 517.

Pupil Teachers, Appointment by the Local Authority in any case in which there are more candidates for the post than there are places to be filled, 1277–1300.

Religious Tests, *see* that sub-heading.

Salaries of Teachers, Jurisdiction of the Local Authority, Position of Managers, etc., 175, 298, 300, 515, 517, 648.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*

Debate in Committee—cont.

Teachers—*cont.*

Salaries of Teachers—*cont.*

Denominational Contribution to Salaries of Teachers, 862, 863, 865, 870.

Dwelling-houses, Consideration of, in fixing Salaries —Rent to be paid by Local Education Authority for houses which would otherwise form a Denominational Contribution to Salaries, 1029, 1031, 1035.

Method of Payment through Managers or by the County Council direct, 768.

Public Funds, Salaries paid out of, 852, 860, 987.

Training of Teachers — Memorandum setting forth the State's ideal sixty years ago, 998.

Trust Deeds of Non-provided Schools.

Modification of.

Appointment and Dismissal of Teachers, Power of, vested in the Clergyman under certain Trust Deeds — Insertion of words in the Bill to make clear the position of Managers, 951, 977.

Control of Religious Instruction by the Managers, Bringing Provisions of the Trust Deeds into harmony with the future situation, 1315, 1318, 1327, 1329, 1331, 1339, 1347, 1350, 1352.

National Society, Model Trust Deed, 1041.

Voluntary Schools.

Assets of Denominational Schools, Buildings, Endowments, etc., 862, 863, 865, 870, 873, 1034.

Audit of Accounts, *see* that sub-heading.

Denominational Character threatened by power proposed for Local Authority of laying down New Conditions from time to time, 410–422.

Proviso that the conditions should concern matters not relating solely to Religious Instruction, 413.

Financial Condition, Hopelessness of, 1248.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate in Committee—cont.*
  - Voluntary Schools—*cont.*
    - Inefficiency of.
      - Board of Education winking at, under existing system, alleged, 179, 180, 181, 184, 1274.
      - Inaccuracy of Statements as to Inefficiency, alleged, 272.
      - Structural Suitability, Requirement not enforced hitherto, 280.
    - Opening and Closing, Regulation of — Powers for Local Authority, proposed, 645–651.
    - Preference for denominational education largely a preference for freedom from a School rate, 153.
    - Proselytising was the result of the Denominational System, 1491–1495, 1498.
    - Rate-aid for Voluntary Schools—Objections to the Application of Rates in support of Denominational Education, 260–274.
      - Act of 1870, Principle of—Public Funds to be applied only for Secular Results, 269.
      - Optional instead of Compulsory Rate-aid, proposed, 255–274.
    - Rural Districts, Superiority of the Voluntary to the small Board Schools, alleged, 257.
    - Starved Condition of Education. Continuance of under Rate Aid if the Local Authorities were allowed to Select Schools or if Rate Aid were made Optional, 145, 151, 153, 263.
      - Statistics showing Expenditure on Rent, Light, Fuel, etc., 263.
      - Teachers, Appointment by Managers — Restriction of area of selection to a particular denomination, 861.
    - Subscriptions, Appropriation of, to the Repairs and Buildings Fund, proposed, 1055, 1080–1089.
  - Welsh County Councils—Possibility of Welsh Councils using powers given for Secular Education, in order to destroy Religious Education, 417–421.
- Education Committee — Eligibility of Ministers of Reigion.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 22*, 467.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- Furniture, Holidays, Prizes, etc., Control of Local Authority.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 23*, 596.
- Government had no right to legislate upon Education without an express mandate.
  - *Os.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Oct. 16*, 46, 50; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 50; Mr. Labouchere, *Oct. 27*, 869; Mr. Lucas, 876.
- Grouping, Question of.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 21*, 359.
- Popular opinion—Antipathy to the Bill.
  - *Os.* Mr. Lloyd George, *Oct. 16*, 45; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 50.
- Pupil Teacherships in Voluntary Schools—Public Notification of Vacancies.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 31*, 1310.
- "Secular," Definition of Term.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 29*, 1061.
- Teachers.
  - Appointment of — Denominational Schools, Power of Local Authority to inquire into Qualifications of Candidates other than the Candidate selected by the Managers.
    - *Q.* *Oct. 29*, 1075.
  - Superannuation, Provision under the School Teachers Superannuation Act—Inserting Clause in Bill, proposed.
    - *Q.* *Oct. 30*, 1185.
- Voluntary Schools.
  - Denominational Schools leased to School Boards—Termination of Agreement and use of Buildings as a Denominational School.
    - *Q.* *Oct. 27*, 828.
  - Pupil Teachership Vacancies, Public Notification.
    - *Q.* *Oct. 31*, 1310.
- Women, Eligibility of.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 27*, 812.

Edwards, Mr. F. [Radnor]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Oct. 27*, 865.

Egerton, Mr. A. de Tatton [Cheshire, Knutsford]
- South Eastern and London, Chatham and Dover Railways Bill, Lords' Amendments, *Oct. 16*, 102, 103.

Elementary School Teachers
- Deferred Annuity Fund Accounts, Date of Circulation.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 29*, 1062.

Elliot, Mr. A. R. D. [Durham]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Oct. 24*, 787.

Ellis, Mr. J. E. [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
Business proposed for the Autumn Sittings, Opportunity for discussion of Irish Grievances refused, Function of the House of Commons, *Oct. 16*, 76.
Education [England and Wales] Bill, *com. Oct. 21*, 371 ; *Oct. 28*, 957.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Amendments to Clause 8 needful to bring its provisions into harmony with Mr. Balfour's Statements at Manchester, Date of placing on the Notice Paper, *Oct. 20*, 358.
Martial Law Commission—Date of Presentation of Report to the House, *Oct 21*, 359.
Motor Cars, Regulations as to Speed, etc. Legislation, *Oct. 27*, 809.
Transvaal—Repatriation of Boer Prsioners—Number re-patriated, Number still in their respective places of confinement, etc., *Oct. 27*, 804.

Emigration and Immigration
Alien Immigration, Royal Commision—Date of Presentation of Report. *Q. Oct. 27*, 809.

Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 27*, 840.

Employment of Children Bill
Bill withdrawn, *Oct 16*, 136.
Re-introduction, Date of. *Q. Oct. 27*, 829.

Employment of Reservists
see Soldiers.

Endowed Schools
Capital and Income of each Endowment, Return proposed. *Q. Oct. 27*, 830.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *see* that title.
Trust Deeds.
National Society Trust Deed, Laying on the Table of the House. *Qs. Oct. 30*, 1196, 1197.
Precedents, Copies of, Laying on the Table of the House. *Qs. Oct. 21*, 348 ; *Oct. 24*, 726 ; *Oct. 30*, 1196.
Copy Presented, *Oct. 30*, 1183 ; *Nov. 3*, 1375.
Religious Teaching for National Schools, Trust Deeds relating to *Q. Oct. 30*, 1186.

Enniskillen
Post Office—Early morning attendance Grievance, Reduction in Number of female appointments proposed. *Q. Nov. 3*, 1386.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorgan, Mid]
Education (England and Wales), Bill, *com,, Oct. 20*, 272, 284, 298 ; *Oct. 21*, 402, 413 ; *Oct. 22*, 514, 538 ; *Oct. 23*, 710, 721, 722 ; *Oct. 27*, 888, 889 ; *Oct. 28*, 956, 967, 972, 976, 977, 980, 981, 987, 1010, 1054, 1055 ; *Oct. 29*, 1133, 1138, 1166, 1167 ; *Oct. 30*, 1238, 1240, 1241, 1289.

Evening Continuation Classes
Scotland—Delay in Payment of Grants. *Q. Oct. 30*, 1184.

Evictions, Ireland
Return of Eviction Notices Presented, *Oct. 31*, 1306 ; *Nov. 3*, 1376.

Executions, Ireland
Coroner's Powers to detain Executioners in order that they should give Evidence at the Inquest—Rules. *Qs. Oct. 22*, 478 ; *Oct. 27*, 819.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
c. 2R., *Oct. 20*, 341 ; *Oct. 21*, 425. *com. Oct. 22*, 553 ; *Oct. 30*, 1304.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
Debate on Second Reading, Oct. 21, 425 ; *Debate in Committee, Oct. 22*, 553.
Carnarvon's, Lord, Protests in 1873, 428.
Division into Expiring Laws Perpetuation Bill and Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed, 436, 553.
Revision of Schedule proposed, 427, 428, 434, 435.

Explosions
Abertysswg Colliery, Gallantry of Miners—Recognition of by award of Albert Medal, proposed. *Q. Nov. 3*, 1396.
Chorley—Reports of Inspector Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 18.

Extradition Treaty
Austria-Hungary and Great Britain—Amendment of Article of Treaty of 1873.
Declaration Presented, *Oct. 16*, 7, 25,
Order of Council Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347 ; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Faber, Mr. G. D. [York]
Coronation Medals dated 26th June—Non-alteration of date on Postponement of the Coronation, *Oct. 27*, 807.

Factories and Workshops
Annual Report of Chief Inspector Presented, *Oct. 16*, 7, 18.
Cotton-weaving Sheds, Standard of Ventilation—Legislation proposed. *Q. Nov. 3*, 1381.
Felt Hats, Manufacture of—Copy of Regulations Presented, *Oct. 16*, 10, 25.
Lead and Zinc Mines — Night Work, Exemption Order, Copy Presented, *Oct. 16*, 10, 24.

Fair Wage Resolution
  M'Connachie Brothers' Contract for supplying Tinned Rations to the Troops in South Africa—Fair Wage Clause in Contract.
    Q. Oct. 28, 941.
  Preserves Contracts for the Navy, Names of Firms, Amount contracted for—Fair Wages Clause, etc.
    Q. Nov. 3, 1382.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
  Imprisonment of, under Crimes (Ireland) Act—Letter to the Speaker, *Oct. 27*, 789.

Fellowes, Mr. A. E. [Hunts, Ramsey]
  Bright's, Mr. J., Statue in the House of Commons—Removal to better position in the outer Lobby proposed, *Oct. 23*, 615.
  House of Commons, Ventilation—Date of Issue of Report of Select Committee of Inquiry, Improvement in Sanitary Conditions, *Oct. 30*, 1194.
  Westminster Abbey—Crucifix erected in Edward the Confessor's Chapel, Authority for, *Oct. 28*, 949.

Felt Hats
  Manufacture of—Regulations Presented, *Oct. 16*, 10, 24.

Fenit Pier
  Charge on Loan for Constructing Pier, Reducing to Treasury Rate of Borrowing Money, proposed.
    Q. Oct. 23, 620.

Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Manchester, N.E.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 21*, 415; *Oct. 29*, 1111; *Oct. 31*, 1341, 1356.

Fertiliser and Feeding Stuffs Act
  Basig Slag, Importation of inferior Slag into Ireland—Enforcing Provisions of Act.
    Q. Oct. 20, 211.

Ffrench, Mr. P. [Wexford, S.]
  Wexford, South—Damage to Roads by Traction Engines, Compelling Owners to repair or contribute towards Upkeep of Roads, *Oct. 27*, 801.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick.]
  Ireland.
    Constabulary, Royal Irish — Insufficient Barrack Accommodation, *Oct. 21*, 351.
    Dublin—Soldiers stationed in, Lack of Barrack Accommodation, Providing Accommodation, *Oct. 21*, 351.
    Kish Lightship—Defect in System of warning Vessels, "Leinster Casualty"—Steps taken to render System effective, *Oct. 20*, 207.
    Lights Board, Constitution of—Legislation, *Oct. 20*, 207.

Field, Mr. W.—*cont.*
  Ireland.—*cont.*
    Post Office—English Officials, Number transferred to Ireland during past 12 months, *Oct. 21*, 349.
  Penrhyn Quarry Dispute—Official Intervention suggested, *Oct. 21*, 351.

Fiji
  Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.
  Federation with New Zealand—Fijian Petition to King Edward desiring Federation, alleged.
    Q. Oct. 20, 216.

Financial Secretary to the Treasury
  Mr. W. H. Fisher.

Finland
  Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Finlay, Sir R. B.—*Attorney General* [Inverness, Burghs.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 168, 174, 190, 194; *Oct. 20*, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300; *Oct. 21*, 375, 378, 379, 380, 382; *Oct. 22*, 493, 496, 497, 517, 518, 519; *Oct. 23*, 654, 655, 668, 669, 717, 718, 721; *Oct. 24*, 734, 737, 738, 739, 743, 748; *Oct. 24*, 756, 768, 770; *Oct. 27*, 883, 888; *Oct. 28*, 955, 957, 962, 963, 968, 969, 971, 975, 976, 977, 987, 1004, 1027, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1040, 1041, 1042; *Oct. 29*, 1085, 1090, 1094, 1095, 1099, 1104, 1105, 1106, 1107, 1108, 1109, 1110, 1118, 1123, 1124, 1127, 1128, 1164, 1165, 1166, 1167; *Oct. 30*, 1229, 1231, 1240, 1241, 1244, 1245, 1246, 1281; *Nov. 3*, 1417, 1459, 1461, 1462, 1472, 1476, 1490, 1491, 1496.
  Expiring Laws Continuance Bills, *com. Oct. 22*, 556, 557, 559, 560, 561, 563.
  London, Crime in—Central Criminal Court Calendar, Number of Persons charged with Murder, *Oct. 23*, 613.
  Rolls, Police Constable, Conviction for Perjury—Laying Copies of Shorthand Writer's Report of Trial on the Table of the House, proposed *Oct. 27*, 811.
  South Eastern and London, Chatham and Dover Railways Bill, Lords Amendments, *Oct. 16*, 105, 107.

First Commissioner of Works
  Lord Windsor.

First Lord of the Treasury
  Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.

Fisher, Mr. Hayes—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Fulham.]
  Crown Property, Number of Hereditaments held by the Crown for which Treasury Bounties in lieu of Rates are paid, Method of Valuation, etc.—Return, *Oct. 23*, 614.
  National Expenditure, Select Committee on—Appointment as Member, Motion to substitute name of Mr. M. Reddy, *Oct. 20*, 249.

[*cont.*

Fisher, Mr. Hayes—*cont.*
Parks.
Ireland, Tenders for Bulbs—Accepting the most advantageous, *Oct. 23*, 630.
Treasury Contributions—Amounts deducted in England, Ireland, and Scotland respectively, Rateability of Phœnix Park Grazing Rents, etc., *Oct. 23*, 614.

Fisheries.
Ireland.
Coomenaum Slip—Estimates for Slip submitted by Surveyor of the Kerry County Council, Rejection by Congested Districts Board. *Q. Oct. 27*, 818.
Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 19.
Sea Fisheries—Harbours, Piers and Boat-slips, Sums Expended on—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 22.
North Sea Fisheries, International Investigation.
Copenhagen Conference.—Publication of Report. *Q. Oct. 23*, 613.
Expenditure, Great Britain's Share—Amounts to be expended by other Countries. *Q. Oct. 23*, 610.
Salmon Fisheries — Report of Commissioners Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 19.
Scotland.
Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 20.
Lewis, Isle of—Congested Districts Board granting Steamship Subsidy to facilitate transit of Fish proposed. *Q. Oct. 28*, 950.
Moray Firth — Closing to Foreign Trawlers.
Christiania Fishery Conference, 1901—Resolution as to closing Firth. *Q. Oct. 30*, 1192.
Copenhagen International Fishing Conference, Discussion at. *Q. Oct. 23*, 613.
Three Mile Limit, Extension of—Representations to the Signatories of the North Sea Convention proposed. *Q. Nov. 3*, 1399.

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill
c. 2R, *Oct. 21*, 453.

Fitzmaurice, Lord E. [Wilts., Cricklade]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 182, 183; *Oct. 23*, 669, 710; *Oct. 28*, 1003, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1051; *Oct. 29*, 1080.

Flags
Civilians' use of Flags on Land, Regulation of—Issue of Warrant proposed. *Q. Oct. 22*, 466.

Flannery, Sir Fortescue [Yorkshire, Shipley]
Woolwich Arsenal—Foremen's Pensions under New Pension Scheme, *Oct. 28*, 945, 946.

Fleets of the World
Return—Alteration in Compilation. *Q. Oct. 23*, 604.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2.) Bill, 2R, *Oct. 22*, 551.
Business of the House—Course of Business, *Oct. 21*, 360.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 2R, *Oct. 20*, 341; *Oct. 21*, 425, 427; *com. Oct. 22*, 558, 561, 567.
Glasgow Rectorial Election Disturbances—Precautions for the Protection of Life and Property, *Oct. 27*, 811, 812.
Ireland.
Land Court Valuers—Opportunities for forming opinions as to Fair Rents of Holdings, etc., *Oct. 29*, 1064.
Local Government Board Employees, Regulations as to Devotion of Entire Time to Duties of Office—Case of Mr. T. P. Nolan acting as Handwriting Expert, *Oct. 20*, 311.
Precedence for Motions dealing with Proceedings under the Crimes Act, *Oct. 16*, 58.
Prisons, Closing.
Number and Names of County Prisons closed in Dec., 1901, by Order of the General Prisons Board, *Oct. 20*, 210.
Utilization of Buildings, Authority Controlling, etc., *Oct. 29*, 1064.
London, Crime in—Central Criminal Court Calendar, Number of Persons Charged with Murder, etc., *Oct. 23*, 612, 613.

Foot and Mouth Disease
Loss suffered by Farmers through Importation of Cattle from Abroad. *Q. Nov. 3*, 1397.

Foreign Jurisdiction Act
Orders in Council Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Foreign Office
Secretary of State—Marquess of Lansdowne.
Under Secretary—Viscount Cranborne.

Foreshore Rights, Ireland
Inch Strand Foreshore, Interference with use of — Ascertaining High Water Mark, Inquiry. *Q. Oct. 27*, 826.
Stoney Estate—Crown Foreshore Rights, Owner of Rostock Castle prosecuting Migratory Labourers for Gathering Seaweed—Representation of the Crown at Castlebar Trial. *Q. Oct. 20*, 207.

"Forty Days on the Table" Motions.
Autumn Sittings, Appropriation for Government Business — Discussion of "Forty Days on the Table" Motions after Twelve o'clock at Night.
Q. Oct. 16, 26; *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *Oct. 16*, 32; Mr. G. Bowles, 37; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 48.

Foster, Sir W. [Derby, Ilkeston]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 30*, 1246; *Nov. 3*, 1450.

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H. [Wolverhampton, E.]
Corn, Sugar and Coal—Amounts received for Duties during present financial Year up till 30th Sept. *Oct. 20*, 206.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 20*, 283; *Oct. 21*, 394; *Oct. 24*, 733, 742, 764, 766; *Oct. 28*, 955, 1039, 1041; *Oct. 30*, 1202, 1203.
Voluntary Schools—Trust Deeds.
National Society Deed, Laying on the Table of the House, *Oct. 30*, 1196, 1197.
Trust Deeds relating to Religious Teaching in National Schools, *Oct. 30*, 1186.

France
Chemical and Metal Industries of Lyons District—Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.
Italy and France, Agreement between, with reference to the *status quo* in the Mediterranean, alleged.
Q. Oct. 23, 608.
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 1, 2, 17.

French Guiana
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 1, 17.

Garter, Order of
Foreign Sovereigns, Number on whom the Garter has been conferred since 1837—Number not of the Christian Faith, Return proposed.
Q. Oct. 20, 221.

General Election of 1900
Government Elected on the issue of the War, No Mandate to Deal with Education, alleged.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Oct. 16*, 50; Mr. Labouchere, *Oct. 27*, 869; Mr. Lucas, 876.

Germany
Afghanistan—Purchase of Arms and Munitions of War in Germany, Landing at Kurrachee and Conveyance across British Territory—Consistence with Agreement between Afghan and British Governments.
Q. Oct. 20, 205.
Africa, South—Portuguese Possessions, Existence of Agreement between H.M. Government and Germany—Communicating Terms to Parliament.
Q. Oct. 22, 471.

Germany—*cont.*
Berlin—London and Berlin, Establishing Telephonic Communication between.
Q. Oct. 23, 617.
Congo Free State—Seizure by German Force in Sept., 1900, of portion of Free States, alleged.
Q. Oct. 22, 470.
Great Britain and Germany, Secret Treaty between, alleged — Communicating Terms to Parliament.
Q. Oct. 22, 470, 471.
Locomotives for East Indian Railway, German Tender accepted in preference to British Tender—Delay in Supplying Locomotives, etc.
Q. Oct. 30, 1191.
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Gibbs, Mr. Vicary [Herts, St. Albans]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 31*, 1318.

Gibraltar
Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.
Defences—Report of Engineer, Publication of.
Q. Oct. 21, 357, 358.
Dock Labourers' Strike, Soldiers and Police unloading Vessels trading in the interests of Private Owners, alleged, Sanction for.
Q. Oct. 20, 218.

Gilhooly, Mr. J. [Cork Co., W.]
White Estate, Delay in Sale to Tenants, *Oct. 23*, 601.

Glasgow
Rectorial Election, Disturbances — Precautions for the Protection of Life and Property.
Q. Oct. 27, 811.

Gloucester, County of
Census—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 21.

Gold Coast
Sekondi Pier.
Draught of Vessels able to use Pier—Name of Engineer advising Situation of Pier, etc.
Q. Oct. 27, 803.
Expense of Construction, Date of Completion, etc.
Q. Oct. 20, 219.

Gordon, Major W. Evans [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
Roumania, Treatment of Jews in, Publication of Correspondence on American Note—Opportunity for discussing Question, *Oct. 20*, 219.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E. [Cambridge University]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 180; *Oct. 20*, 260, 416; *Oct. 23*, 648, 707; *Oct. 27*, 847; *Oct. 28*, 960, 990, 1007, 1133; *Oct. 30*, 1245, 1281; *Nov. 3*, 1432, 1433, 1435, 1439, 1442.

Gothenburg
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 1, 17.

Goulding, Mr. E. A. [Wilts, Devizes]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 31*, 1347.

Government Departments
Employment of Discharged Soldiers and Sailors—Carrying out Recommendations of Select Committee.
Q. Oct. 30, 1185.

Grant, Mr. Corrie [Warwickshire, Rugby]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 159, 176; *Oct. 22*, 495; *Oct. 23*, 653, 658, 680; *Oct. 24*, 729; *Oct. 29*, 1123.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—"Secular," Definition of term, *Oct. 29*, 1061.

Gray, Mr. E. [West Ham, North]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 16*, 122, 130; *Oct. 17*, 166, 176; *Oct. 21*, 380; *Oct. 22*, 547; *Oct. 23*, 670, 680; *Oct. 24*, 788; *Oct. 27*, 890; *Oct. 30*, 1235; *Nov. 3*, 1444, 1473.

Great Southern and Western Railway
Train Service between Newmarket, Cork, and Waterford—Complaints.
Q. Oct. 29, 1077.

Greenwich Hospital
Pensions to Widows of Seamen killed on duty, Relieving Greenwich Hospital Funds.
Q. Oct 20, 221.

Greenwich Observatory
Report of Astronomer Royal Presented, *Oct. 16*, 24.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. [Northumberland, Berwick]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 167; *Oct. 21*, 397, 411; *Oct. 22*, 547; *Oct. 28*, 988; *Oct. 29*, 1135; *Oct. 30*, 1207, 1243, 1244, 1263, 1266; *Nov. 3*, 1425, 1448.

Griffith, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey].
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 21*, 420; *Oct. 23*, 654; *Oct. 28*, 1002.

Guardafui
Lighthouse, Establishment of, proposed.
Q. Oct. 29, 1073.

Guardians
Oxford Board of Guardians—Increase in Representation of Parishes of St. Thomas, St. Ebbe, and St. Aldgate, proposed—Inquiry.
Q. Oct. 17, 141.

Guiana, French
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 1, 17.

Guinea, Dutch
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Guns
Machine Guns, Number of Yeomanry Regiments supplied with.
Q. Oct. 22, 464.

Gurdon, Sir Brampton [Norfolk, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 27*, 866; *Oct. 29*, 1114.
Pacific Islanders resident in Queensland—Exemption from Terms of Pacific Islands Labourers Act, *Oct. 22*, 466.

Gurrin, Mr. [Treasury Handwriting Expert]
Sullivan, Sergeant, Charge of Forged Incitement to Outrage—Evidence of Mr. Gurrin.
Debate on Motion for Adjournment, Oct. 20, 309, 310, 312, 317, 332, 336.

Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord George—*Secretary of State for India* [Middlesex, Ealing]
Army—Conditions of Service of British Troops, Change in Indian Government Views—Laying Papers before Parliament, *Oct. 20*, 224.
Assam Tea Gardens, Excessive Number of Government Liquor Shops, Inquiry into Excise arrangements of the Province, Laying Papers on the Table of the House, *Oct 20*, 225.
Barmaids, Employment of in Bengal and Burma—Withdrawal of Order prohibiting Employment, Legal Powers of Local Governments — Amending Law, *Oct. 21*, 352.
Financial Obligations of India in Imperial Matters, Agreement between Imperial and Indian Governments, Publication of Correspondence, *Oct. 27*, 807.
Imperial Council, Holding Session at Delhi on occasion of the Coronation Durbar, proposed, *Oct. 20*, 225.
Railways.
German Locomotives for East Indian Railway, Delay in supplying—Acceptance of British Tenders in preference to German Tenders, proposed, *Oct. 30*, 1192.
Madras Railway, Management of—Contracts for Material and Freight given to German Firms, alleged, *Nov. 3*, 1393.
Somaliland—British Military Operations, Cost not chargeable to Indian Revenues, *Oct. 27*, 807.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. W.—*President of the Board of Agriculture* [Preston]
Argentine Cattle, Importation into Great Britain proposed, Security against admission of diseased Cattle—Negotiations with Argentine Government, *Oct. 20*, 229.
Canadian Store Cattle, Healthiness of—Abrogation of embargo on sale in English and Scottish Markets, proposed, *Nov 3*, 1397.
Colonial Cattle, Importation into Great Britain—Colonial Conference Negotiations, Extending period for Slaughtering Cattle from 10 days to longer period after arrival, proposed—Inquiry, *Oct. 21*, 353.

[*cont.*

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. W.—*cont.*

Corn Returns—Separate Returns, proposed, Distinguishing between Malting and Grinding Barley, etc., *Oct. 22*, 472.

Hants, County of

Census—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 21.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William [Monmouthshire, W.]

Business of the House—Course of Business, *Oct. 29*, 1079.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 17*, 145, 147, 148, 149, 168, 173, 174, 178, 179, 194; *Oct. 20*, 254, 279, 280, 297; *Oct. 21*, 377, 378, 380, 390, 391, 392, 393, 418; *Oct. 22*, 498, 506, 507, 508, 518, 520, 535; *Oct. 23*, 649, 656, 663, 668, 670, 678; *Oct. 24*, 735, 741, 755, 756, 758, 766, 787; *Oct. 27*, 853; *Oct. 28*, 952, 955, 959, 960, 982, 1027, 1029, 1033, 1040; *Oct. 29*, 1097, 1111, 1125; *Oct. 31*, 1319, 1355, 1364.

Ireland—Opportunity for Discussion of Irish Grievances during the Autumn Sittings, *Oct. 16*, 62.

Supply—Effect of New Procedure Rule, Production of Estimates after Committee of Supply was closed, *Oct. 16*, 47.

Hard Labour Sentences

Disqualification from Service on public boards entailed by, Mr. P. J. Kelly's alleged statement.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1063.

Hardie, Mr. J. Keir [Merthyr Tydvil]

Army, Contracts—M'Connachie Brothers' Contract for supplying Tinned Rations to the Troops in South Africa, Number of Tins rejected, etc., *Oct. 28*, 941.

Navy—Preserves Contracts—Names of Firms, Amount contracted for, Fair Wages Clause, etc., *Nov. 3*, 1382.

Postmen in East Central District—Holiday Pay on Coronation Day, *Oct. 23*, 595.

Post Office, London Sorters' Grievances—Memorial to the Postmaster-General, Delay in Answer, *Oct. 31*, 1309.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 29*, 1085, 1159; *Oct. 31*, 1337, 1340

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L. [Caithness]

Scotland—Liquor Traffic Reform, Government Intentions as to Legislation during present Session, *Oct. 28*, 938.

Harrell, Mr.

Resident Magistrate — Number of Attendances at Crimes Act Courts.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 822.

Harrington, Mr. T. [Dublin, Harbour]

Sullivan, Sergeant, Charges against—Action of the Government, etc., *Oct. 20*, 328, 329.

Hartlepool County Court

Peart *v.* Furness, Workmen's Compensation Case—Medical Referee acting as Medical Witness.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1395.

Haslett, Sir J. [Belfast, N.]

Belfast Lough—Establishment of Naval Training School, and visit of Guardship, proposed, *Oct. 21*, 350.

Hats—Felt Hats

Manufacture of—Regulations Presented, *Oct. 16*, 10, 25.

Hay, Mr. C. G. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]

Lewes Naval Prison, Condemnation of, as unfit for use, alleged—Continued use, *Oct. 20*, 206.

Piccadilly, City, and North-East London Railways Bill, *re-com.* *Oct. 29*, 1149.

Post Office Employees and Bank Holidays, Refusal of Payment in lieu of leave, alleged, *Nov. 3*, 1385.

Soldiers—Number in Civil Prisons, *Oct. 20*, 206, 214; *Oct. 28*, 945.

South-Eastern and London, Chatham and Dover Railways Bill, Lords Amendments, *Oct. 16*, 99, 101.

Telegraphists and the Royal Progress—Granting same Concessions to London Telegraphists as on Coronation Day, *Oct. 22*, 473.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony, Taxation of,
  Opportunity for Discussion, *Oct. 28*, 944.
  Ten per Cent. Tax on Mining Profits, etc., *Oct. 20*, 217.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]

Atlantic Shipping Trust, Government Agreement with—Advance of Money *Oct. 20*, 228.

Business of the House, Government Business, Motion for Precedence—Amendment for discussion of Irish Affairs, *Oct. 16*, 40, 41.

Crimes Act, Question as to, already debated this Session, *Oct. 16*, 74.

Crown Property, Number of Hereditaments held by the Crown for which Treasury Bounties in lieu of rates are paid—Method of Valuation, etc., Return, *Oct. 23*, 614; *Oct. 31*, 1307.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 2R. *Oct. 21*, 427, 428, 433; *com.* *Oct. 22*, 574.

Ireland.
  Leenane Post Office—Religious Tests for Employees, *Oct. 22*, 473.
  Maher, Mr. T., Trial for riotous behaviour — Sentence of Hard Labour, alleged, *Oct. 22*, 475.
  Parks, Tender, for Bulbs—Accepting lowest Tender, *Oct. 23*, 630.
  Pharmaceutical Society, Apparent Exclusion of Roman Catholics—Modification of Constitution of Society, proposed, *Oct. 31*, 1311.

[*cont.*

Healy, Mr. T. M.—*cont.*
- Ireland—*cont.*
  - Railways—Transport of Troops, Selection of Route, Boycott of Southern Railroads, alleged, *Oct. 23*, 629, 630.
- Land Purchase Acts (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *Oct. 20*, 341, 342.
- Parks, Treasury Contributions—Amounts deducted in England, Ireland and Scotland respectively, Rateability of grazing Rents in Phœnix Park, etc., *Oct. 23*, 614, 615; *Oct. 31*, 1307.
- Uganda—Watchful care of the British Government, Comfort for Irish Members, *Oct. 16*, 57.

Heaton, Mr. J. Henniker [Canterbury]
- Telephone Service.
  - Brussels and London, and Berlin and London, Establishing Communication between, *Oct. 23*, 617.
  - Paris and London, Period during which present Rate of Charge has been in force—Cost of Construction of French section of Line, etc., *Oct. 23*, 616.

Helme, Mr. W. [Lancashire, Lancaster]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 160; *Oct. 20*, 277; *Oct. 21*, 373; *Oct. 23*, 645, 651.

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. C. H. [Tyrone, N.]
- Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2.) Bill, 2R. *Oct. 22*, 550.
- McCloskey, T., Suit against District Inspector Holmes, Costs—Dismissal of Charge at Strabane Petty Sessions, *Oct. 27*, 823.

Henry, P.
- Prosecution of, by Excise Authorities—Dismissal of Case by Magistrates—Refunding Costs of the Defence, proposed.
  Q. Oct. 27, 825.

Historic Relics, Ireland
- Inishvickillane Island — Removal of Relics by the Irish Lights Board.
  Q. Oct. 29, 1065.

Hoare, Sir S. [Norwich]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 21*, 367.

Hobhouse, Mr. C. [Bristol]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 20*, 287, 288; *Oct. 22*, 513, 545; *Oct. 23*, 663.

Hobhouse, Mr. H. [Somerset, E.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 151; *Oct. 21*, 374; *Oct. 22*, 492; *Oct. 23*, 677, 709; *Oct. 24*, 767; *Oct. 28*, 977, 984, 1036; *Oct. 29*, 1108; *Oct. 30*, 1207, 1283; *Oct. 31*, 1348; *Nov. 3*, 1477.

Hobhouse, Mr. H.—*cont.*
- Licensing Act, 1902 — Home Office Regulations for Guidance of Police Authorities, *Oct. 23*, 597.
- Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament) Bill, 2R. *Oct. 21*, 451.

Home Office
- *Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. A. Akers Douglas.
- *Under Secretary*—Hon. Thos. H. A. E. Cochrane.

Honduras, British
- Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Hong Kong
- Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 27*, 792; *Nov. 3*, 1376.
- Building Ordinances — Appointment of Additional Inspectors.
  Q. Nov. 3, 1388.
- Cable Communication.
  - Landing Rights, Granting for purposes of Laying Cables—Instructions to Hong Kong Government, proposed.
    Q. Nov. 30, 1193.
  - Rates, Reduction of.
    Q. Oct. 28, 948.
- Post Office—Date of constructing new building.
  Q. Oct. 27, 802.
- Sanitation—Reports of Medical and Sanitary Experts, etc.
  Q. Oct. 22, 469.

Honours
- Garter, Order of — Foreign Sovereigns, Number on whom the Garter has been conferred since 1837—Number not of the Christian Faith—Return proposed.
  Q. Oct. 20, 221.
- Royal Prerogative, Exercise of, on advice of Ministers or otherwise.
  Q. Oct. 20, 221.

Hope, Mr. J. D. [Fife, W.]
- Scotland, Telegraphic Communication with England, Frequency in Breakdown of Wires—Extending Underground System, *Oct. 23*, 617.

Hope, Mr. J. F. [Sheffield, Brightside]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 163, 170; *Oct. 29*, 113; *Oct. 30*, 1208; *Nov. 3*, 1428.

Horses for the Army
- Commissioned Officers, Employment of—Outside Advice and Experience.
  Q. Oct. 22, 465.
- Hungarian Purchases—Advice given to Gen. Truman, Lord Roberts, etc., by Hungarian Gentleman — Reason for ignoring advice.
  Q. Oct 20, 214.
- Lonsdale, Lord, Employment of.
  Q. Oct. 22, 465.
- Remount Department.
  - Accommodation for—Procuring Accommodation adjacent to the War Office, etc.,
    Q. Oct. 23, 606.

[*cont.*

Horses for the Army—*cont.*
Remount Department—*cont.*
Inquiry—Conduct of by Gen. Truman — Costs, Sums paid to Gen. Truman for Counsel, and to the Assessor appointed by the War Office.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 602.
Remuneration of Legal Assessor, Scale of.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1067.
Report.
Commander-in-Chief's Opinion—Publication of.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 605.
Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 19, 25; *Nov. 3*, 1374.
Staff—Delay in increasing Staff on the Outbreak of the South African War.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 606.

Hospital, Limerick.
Condition of Roads—Neglect as to repairs.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 476.

Hospitals
Military Isolation Hospital at Shorncliffe, Establishment of, close to Hythe to Sandgate Road proposed—Expediency of selecting another Site.
Q. *Oct. 31*, 1306.

Hospitals (Contributions) Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, *Oct. 16*, 135.

Hours of Labour for Railway Servants
see Railway Servants.

House of Commons
see Parliament.

House of Lords
see Parliament.

Housing of the Working Classes
Loans—Term of Repayment, Carrying out Report of Select Committee.
Q. *Oct 27*, 808.

Humphreys-Owen, Mr. A. C. [Montgomery]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 17*, 161, 191; *Oct. 21*, 361, 373; *Oct. 22*, 515; *Oct. 28*, 953, 1008, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1027, 1038; *Oct. 29*, 1089, 1123.

Hungary
Horses for the British Army, Purchase of, Advice given to Gen. Truman, Lord Roberts, etc., by Hungarian Gentleman—Reason for ignoring.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 214.

Huntingdon
Technical Instruction—Minutes sanctioning Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act, Presented, *Oct. 23*, 592; *Nov. 3*, 1378.

Hutton, Mr. A. E. [York, W. R., Morley]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 16*, 121; *Oct. 17*, 144, 145, 166, 187, 188, 190; *Oct. 20*, 260, 261; *Oct. 21*, 407, 408. 409, 411, 536; *Oct. 23*, 639, 644, 667; *Oct. 24*, 732, 733, 777; *Oct. 28*, 951, 954, 1008; *Oct. 29*, 1098, 1131.

Imperial Institute
Indian Section—Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 21.

Imprisonment of Members
Communications to the Speaker, Infraction of Custom, alleged—Vindicating Rights of the House.
O. Mr. J. Morley, *Oct. 16*, 65.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 220.
Irish Nationalist Parliamentary Party, *see* that title.

Inagua
Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Inch Strand
Foreshore Rights, Interference with — Ascertaining High Water Mark, Inquiry.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 826.

Income Tax
Athlone—Number of Appeals from Assessments, Dissatisfaction caused by Increase of Assessment.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1384.
Woolwich Arsenal—Paymaster Acting as Assessor and Collector of Income Tax, Altering Procedure proposed.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 805.

India
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Lord G. Hamilton.
Under Secretary—Earl Percy.
Aden—Hospital Arrangements for Troops engaged in Somaliland Operations.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 799.
Afghanistan and Russia, Establishment of direct relations between—Diplomatic Communications.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 208.
Agricultural Banks, Establishment of.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 463.
Assam.
Liquor Traffic—Excessive Number of Government Liquor Shops in Tea Gardens — Inquiry into Excise Arrangements of the Province, Laying Papers on the Table of the House.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 225.
Army.
Conditions of Service of British Troops, Change in Indian Government Views — Date of Laying Papers before Parliament.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 224.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*
Army—*cont.*
Medical Corps, Increase in Pay.
Q. Oct. 30, 1184.

Somaliland Operations, Indian Troops taking part in.
Qs. Oct. 20, 222; *Oct. 23*, 609; *Oct. 27*, 946.

Volunteers at the Coronation — Government Employees receiving no pay for Extra Period of their detention owing to the King's illness, alleged.
Q. Oct. 22, 462.

Bengal.
Barmaids—Viceroy rescinding Order of Local Governor prohibiting Employment of Women as Barmaids.
Q. Oct. 21, 352.

Law Classes — Reviving Presidency College Classes and abolishing affiliated Classes, proposed.
Q. Oct. 27, 800.

Boer Prisoners.
Repatriation of—Number still in Indian Camps.
Q. Oct. 27, 804.

Civil Service Examinations—Regulations Presented, *Oct. 16*, 10, 23.

Crops.
Food Crops, Increase in yield, Statistics.
Q. Oct. 22, 594.

Dhar—Confiscation of Property of Ramchandra Rao owing to alleged Complicity in Indian Mutiny—Claims of the Dewar of Dhar's other descendants.
Q. Oct. 23, 593.

Documents—Public Sale of Government Confidential Documents, Prevention of Recurrence of Offence.
Q. Oct. 20, 204.

Education.
Law Classes.
Bengal Classes—Reviving Presidency College Classes and abolishing affiliated Classes proposed.
Q. Oct. 27, 800.

Local Classes, Proposed closing of —Protecting interests of the Poorer Students.
Q. Oct. 27, 801.

Technical and Industrial Education, Development of — Government Intentions.
Q. Oct. 28, 939.

Universities Commission Report—Educational Policy founded on Report, Opportunity for discussion in the House prior to adoption.
Q. Oct. 27, 800.

India—*cont.*
Finance.
Accounts and Papers relating to Revenue of India, Referring to Committee of whole House—Resolution [Lord G. Hamilton], *Nov. 3*, 1407.

Budget—Opportunity for Discussion.
Qs. Mr. Caine, *Oct. 16*, 37; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 48.

Loans raised in England chargeable on the Revenues of India—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 23.

Somaliland Operations — Charging portion of Cost upon the Indian Revenue.
Qs. Oct. 27, 793, 807.

Financial Obligations in Imperial Matters, Agreement between Imperial and Indian Governments—Publication of Correspondence.
Q. Oct. 27, 806.

Imperial Council, Holding Session at Delhi on occasion of the Coronation Durbar, proposed.
Q. Oct. 20, 225.

Irrigation.
Grant of 25 Lakhs, Allocation of.
Q. Oct. 30, 1183.

Revenue derived from, between March 31, 1875, and March 31, 1900.
Q. Oct. 21, 349.

Land, Area in occupation and cultivation in each province.
Q. Oct. 29, 1059.

Land Revenue Defaulters—Number of Writs and Warrants issued against.
Q. Oct. 29, 1058.

Law.
Bengal Law Classes—Reviving Presidency College Classes, and abolishing affiliated Classes, proposed.
Q. Oct. 27, 800.

Local Law Classes, Proposed closing of—Protecting Interests of the Poorer Students.
Q. Oct. 27, 801.

Natu, Sirdar Balvant Ramchandra, Claims of—Government Reply.
Q. Oct. 22, 462.

Police Administration, Appointment of Committee of Inquiry.
Q. Oct. 23, 595.

Public Works.
Revenue derived from, between March 31, 1875, and March 31, 1900.
Q. Oct. 21, 349.

Railways.
East India Railway—Contracts for Locomotives placed with German Firms, Shipment by British Liners, proposed.
Q. Nov. 3, 1382.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*
Railways—*cont.*
German Locomotives for East Indian Railway, Delay in Supply of, etc.—German Tender accepted in preference to British Tender.
Qs. Oct. 30, 1191.
Madras Railway, Management of—Contracts for Material and Freight given to German Firms, alleged.
Q. Oct. 24, 726; *Nov. 3*, 1392.
Native Third Class Passengers, Treatment by Police—Inquiry.
Q. Oct. 23, 595.
Revenue derived from, between March 31, 1875, and March 31, 1900.
Q. Oct. 21, 349.
Somaliland Operations, Despatch of Troops, and Financial Obligations of India.
see sub-headings Army and Finance.
Statistical Abstract, 1891, 1892, to 1901, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 21.
Technical and Industrial Education.
Development of—Government Intentions.
Q. Oct. 28, 939.
Trade.
Persia, Trade with—Agreement between Russia and Persia, and Turkey and Persia, affecting treatment in respect of Customs Duties of British and Indian Goods — Laying Correspondence with Indian Government on the Table of the House, proposed.
Q. Oct. 21, 357.
Review of Trade, 1900 and 1901, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 21.

Industrial Schools
see Reformatories and Industrial Schools.

Inebriate Reformatories
Inebriates Committed under section 5 of the Licensing Act, 1902—Regulations Presented, *Oct. 27*, 792; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Inflammable Liquids
Carriage of, on Railways—Attitude of Managers, etc.
Q. Nov. 3, 1384.

Inishvickillane, Kerry
Historic Relics—Removal of, by the Irish Lights Board.
Q. Oct. 29, 1065.

Innkeepers' Liability Bill
c. 1R., *Oct. 22*, 492.

Intermediate Education, Ireland
Additional Rule Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 23.

Inverness
Prison—Order for Closing existing Prison, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 25.

Ireland
Lord Lieutenant—Earl of Dudley.
Chief Secretary—Rt. Hon. G. Wyndham.
Attorney General—Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.
Lord Chancellor—Lord Ashbourne.
Agrarian Combinations, Treatment of, contrasted with Treatment of Trade Combinations in England.
Q. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 27*, 900.
Agrarian Crime, Queen's County, Freedom from Agrarian Crime, Statistics—Withdrawal of Proclamation proposed.
Qs. Oct. 20, 209; *Oct. 27*, 823.
Agriculture.
Basig Slag, Importation of inferior Slag—Enforcing Provisions of Fertilizer and Feeding Stuffs Act.
Q. Oct. 20, 211.
Report of the Agricultural Board for Year ending 31st March, 1902.—Date of Presentation.
Q. Oct. 23, 601.
Statistics Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 20.
Arms and Ammunition imported from Birmingham—Provisions of Peace Preservation Act of 1881.
Q. Nov. 3, 1400.
Athlone Income Tax Appeals, Number lodged—Dissatisfaction at increase in Assessments alleged.
Q. Nov. 3, 1384.
Ballina Post Office.—Change of Site.
Q. Oct. 23, 595.
Ballymoney Post Office—Negotiations for acquiring new Site, alleged.
Q. Oct. 23, 596.
Banking Statistics — Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 20.
Barrow Drainage Works—Giving effect to Recommendations of Commission of 1885.
Q. Oct. 29, 1063
Basig Slag, Importation of, as a Fertilizer—Inferiority of Slag, Enforcing Provisions of Fertilizer and Feeding Stuffs Act.
Q. Oct. 20, 211.
Belfast, *see* that title.
Belfast Lough Naval Training School, Establishment of, proposed—Visit of Guardship to Lough.
Q. Oct. 21, 350.
Blacksod Bay—Port of Call for alleged line of subsidised Steamers to run between Liverpool and Canada.
Q. Oct. 22, 482.
Boyle, Royal Irish Constabulary—Extra Force alleged.
Q. Oct. 28, 950.
Brighton Vale, Sale of Martello Tower—Amount realised.
Q. Nov. 3, 1404.

[*cont.*

- **Ireland**—*cont.*
  - Canal Tolls, Reduction of, to correspond with Railway Rates, proposed.
    Q. *Nov. 3*, 1387.
  - Capital Punishment—Rules for regulating the Execution of Capital Sentences, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 23.
  - Castlebar Court House, Use of, for Public Meetings—High Sheriff's right to forbid Meetings.
    Q. *Oct. 27*, 824.
  - Castlerea — Royal Irish Constabulary, Extra Force, Number of, Cost, etc.
    Q. *Oct. 28*, 950.
  - Cavan and Leitrim Assizes, White Glove Calendar—Withdrawal of Proclamation under the Crimes Act, proposed.
    Q. *Nov. 3*, 1403.
  - Chancery Division of the Supreme Court of Judicature—Pension of Registrar, Treasury Minute Presented, *Oct. 30*, 1182; *Oct. 31*, 1306.
  - Clones Post Office—Delay in building new Post Office, Complaints of Staff as to hours of Work, etc.
    Q. *Oct. 29*, 1060.
  - Clonmel Land Appeals—Holiday Sittings in Clonmel, proposed.
    Q. *Oct. 29*, 1062.
  - Cloonacool, Excise Prosecution against P. Henry, Dismissal of Case by Magistrates—Refunding Costs of the Defence, proposed.
    Q. *Oct. 27*, 825.
  - Coercion, Revival of, *see* Crimes (Ireland) Acts.
  - Congested Districts, Population, Valuation, etc., 1891-1901—Return Ordered, *Oct. 23*, 593.
  - Congested Distficts Board, *see* that title.
  - Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see* that title.
  - Coomenaum—Estimates for Slip submitted by Surveyor of the Kerry County Council, Rejection by Congested Districts Board.
    Q. *Oct. 27*, 818.
  - Cork.
    - Exhibition—Visit of the Chief Secretary, State of the City, Withdrawal of Proclamation, proposed.
      Q. *Nov. 3*, 1401.
    - Labourers' Cottages Refusal to Sanction Rural District Council's Scheme.
      Q. *Oct. 27*, 821.
    - Rural District Improvement Scheme, Delay in Sanction of.
      Q. *Oct. 23*, 618.
    - Steamship Service—Subsidy to the Clyde Shipping Company granted by Congested Districts Board, Refusal of similar Subsidy to competing Port of Limerick.
      Q. *Oct. 20*, 231.
  - County Court Judges, *see* that title.
  - Court Houses, Use of, for Political Meetings—Instructions to Sheriffs.
    Qs. *Oct. 23*, 623; *Oct. 27*, 824.
- **Ireland**—*cont.*
  - Crimelessness of Ireland — Absence of Agrarian Crimes, etc.
    Os. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 27*, 895; Mr. Wyndham, 918; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 929.
  - Crimes (Ireland) Acts, *see* that title.
  - Curran, Judge.
    - Administration of the Crimes Act—Submitting Salaries of County Court Judges to the Criticism of the House.
      Q. *Oct. 27*, 827.
    - Mullingar Quarter Sessions, Conduct of Judge Curran in tearing up Resolution passed by Grand Jury requesting withdrawal of Proclamation of County.
      Qs. *Oct. 20*, 240, 241.
  - Dingle.
    - Harbour, Application for Grant under Provisions of Marine Works Bill—Consideration of Application.
      Q. *Oct. 23*, 620.
    - Railway, Grant for carrying out alterations recommended by Local Government Board Inspector, proposed
      Q. *Oct. 23*, 620.
  - Down, County, Court Houses, Use of, for Political Meetings—Instructions to High Sheriff.
    Q. *Oct. 23*, 623.
  - Dublin, *see* that title.
  - Enniskillen Post Office—Early Morning Attendance Grievance, Reduction in Number of Female Appointments, proposed.
    Q. *Nov. 3*, 1386.
  - Eviction Notices—Returns Presented, *Oct. 31*, 1306; *Nov. 3*, 1375.
  - Excise—Prosecution of P. Henry of Cloonacool by the Excise Authorities, Dismissal of Case by Magistrates—Refunding Costs of the Defence proposed.
    Q. *October 27*, 825.
  - Executions, Coroner's powers to detain Executioners in order that they should give evidence at the Inquest—Rules.
    Qs. *Oct. 22*, 478; *Oct. 27*, 819.
  - Fenit Pier—Reducing Charge on Loan for Construction of Pier to Treasury rate of borrowing money.
    Q. *Oct. 23*, 620.
  - Fisheries, *see* that title.
  - Foreshore Rights.
    - Inch Strand Foreshore, Interference with use of—Ascertaining High Water Mark, Inquiry.
      Q. *Oct. 27*, 826.
    - Stoney Estate, Crown Foreshore Rights—Owner of Rostock Castle prosecuting migratory Labourers for gathering Seaweed, Representation of the Crown at Castlebar Trial.
      Q. *Oct. 20*, 207.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Government of Ireland.

Coercion, Revival of, *see* Crimes (Ireland) Acts.

Failure of "Twenty Years of Resolute Government" Policy.
O. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Oct. 27*, 932.

Historic Relics, Removal of from Inishvickillane by the Irish Lights Board.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1065.

Hospital, County Limerick—Condition of Roads, Neglect as to Repairs.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 476.

Inch Strand Foreshore Rights, Interference with—Ascertaining High Water Mark, Inquiry.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 826.

Inishvickillane Island—Removal of Historic Relics by the Irish Lights Board.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1065.

Intermediate Education—Additional Rule Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 23.

Judges, *see* County Court Judges.

Jury-packing, *see* that title.

Kanturk and Newmarket Railway—Complaints as to traffic arrangements.
Q. *Oct 29*, 1077.

Kenmare Port, Claims for Assistance under the Marine Works (Ireland) Act—Consideration of Claims.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 354.

Kerry Fisheries—Estimates for a Slip at Coomenaum submitted by Surveyor of the Kerry County Council, Rejection by Congested Districts Board.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 818.

Kilfree Postal Service, Improvement in, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 798.

Kilmallock Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Patrick Hayes' Refusal to allow Entry on his Lands.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1187.

Kish Lightship—Defect in System of warning Vessels, "Leinster" casualty—Steps taken to improve System.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 207.

Labourers, *see* that title.

Labourer's Cottages—for collective heading *see* title Labourer's Cottages.

Land Commission—For collective heading *see* title Land Commission.

Land Question, *see* that title.

Leenane Post Office—Religious Tests for Employees.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 473.

Lehud Fishing Harbour, Improvement of—Congested Districts Board Contribution towards Cost.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 599.

Lights Boards, Constitution of—Legislation.
Qs. *Oct. 20*, 207; *Oct. 27*, 795.

Ireland—*cont.*

Lights and Lighthouses.

Kish Lightship—Defect in System of warning vessels, "Leinster" casualty—Steps taken to improve system.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 207.

Strangford Lough—Wreck of the "William Bailey," Lighthouse being without Light or Beacon.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 795.

Limerick, *see* that title.

Lisburn Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Delay in communicating Report of Local Government Board Inspector to the District Council.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1065.

Liscannor Harbour—Date of carrying out Provisions of Marine Works (Ireland) Bill.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 209.

Local Governing Bodies.

Contracts—Allotting Contracts according to Politics of persons tendering.
Os. Mr. Wyndham, *Oct. 27*, 917, 925.

Proclamations under the Crimes Act, an attempt to terrorize, alleged.
Os. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 27*, 902; Capt. Donelan, 907.

Local Government Board.

Employees—Conditions of Service—Regulations as to devotion of entire time to duties of Office—Case of Mr. T. P. Nolan, acting as Handwriting Expert.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 211; *Oct. 27*, 813.

Lord Lieutenant's Allowance, Supplementary Vote for.
Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Oct. 16*, 30.

Lunacy Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 19.

Lurgan—Date of building new Post Office.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1385.

McCloskey, T., Suit against District Inspector Holmes for Arrest and False Imprisonment, Costs—Dismissal of Charge at Strabane Petty Sessions.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 823.

Macroom Union—W. Creedon's Application for Cottage.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 476.

Maher, Mr. T., Trial for riotous behaviour—Sentence of Hard Labour, alleged.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 475.

Magistrates and Justices of Peace, *see* that title.

Ireland—*cont.*

Mayo, North, Piers and Harbours—Claims of North Mayo to Grants from New Fund.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 600.

Mercantile Marine Statistics — Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 20.

Mohill Rural District Council—Unexpended Balance appropriated by the County, Inquiry.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1401.

Monasterevan Railway Accident, Cause of — Company's delay in reporting Accident to the Board of Trade.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 230.

Morris, Judge O'Connor—Administration of the Crimes Act — Submitting Salaries of County Court Judges to the Criticism of the House.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 827.

Mullingar Quarter Sessions—Conduct of Judge Curran in tearing up Resolution passed by Grand Jury requesting Withdrawal of Proclamation of County.
Qs. *Oct. 20*, 240, 241.

Newry — Royal Irish Constabulary, Number and Religious Denominations of Force stationed in Newry.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 599.

Orange Demonstration at Rostrevor and Newry—Firearms carried by Orangemen, Partial Operation of the Peace Preservation Act, etc.
Os. Mr. T. M. Healy, *Oct. 22*, 574; Mr. MacVeagh, 579.

Orange Party in Belfast, Illegal Pressure on Member for South Belfast and Mr. S. Boal—Proclaiming Local Orange Body as an illegal Association, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 814.

Parks — Tenders for Bulbs — Accepting lowest Tender.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 630.

Pawnbrokers—Returns for 1901, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 24.

Pharmaceutical Society—Officials, Apparent Exclusion of Roman Catholics—Modification of Constitution of Society proposed.
Q. *Oct. 31*, 1311.

Piers and Harbours, for collective heading *see* Piers and Harbours.

Poor Law Audits, Appointment of Inspectors and Auditors from the Poor Law Service, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1403.

Post Office, for collective heading *see* title Post Office— Ireland.

Presbyterian Church—Precedence of the Moderator of the General Assembly.
Q. *Oct 23*, 629.

Moore's, Mr., Question on the Paper addressed to the Home Secretary —Question of Privilege.
Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Moore, *Oct. 23*, 589.

Ireland—*cont.*

Prisons, *see* that title.

Proclaimed Districts, *see* title Crimes (Ireland) Acts.

Queen's County — Proclamation under Crimes Act, Freedom from Agrarian Crime, Statistics — Withdrawal of Proclamation proposed.
Qs. *Oct. 20*, 209; *Oct. 27*, 823.

Railways, for collective heading *see* title Railways.

Rae Estate.
Delay in Sale to Tenants.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 483.

Receiver's Accounts, Furnishing Copy to Mr. Rae, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1065.

Rifle Clubs—Treatment of Ireland as compared with other parts of the United Kingdom, Effect of Peace Preservation Act, etc.
Debate on Second Reading of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Oct. 21, 426, 432; *Oct. 22*, 570, 574.

Rostrevor—Public Meeting, Proclamation of Names of Persons who were consulted as to advisability of proclaiming Meeting.
Q. *Oct. 24*, 727.

Royal University — Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 7, 20.

Skibbereen Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Rural District Council Application for Loan.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1078.

Sligo Prison, Number of Prisoners in under the Crimes Act on April 24 and Oct. 23, 1902.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1195.

Staigue Fort—Calling attention of Board of Works to Condition of Fort.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 210.

Stoney Estate, Mallaranny—Crown Foreshore Rights, Owner of Rostock Castle prosecuting Migratory Labourers for gathering Seaweed — Representation of the Crown at Castlebar Trial.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 207.

Strangford Lough—Wreck of the "William Bailey," Lighthouse being unprovided with Light or Beacon.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 795.

Sullivan, Sergeant, Charges against, *see* Sullivan.

Swords Borough School Scholarship, M. Keegan disqualified by Examiners.—Referring Matter to National Board of Education.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1077.

Taxation.

Local Taxation Account—Distribution of Accumulated Balance.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 620.

Tipperary Labourers, Allotments for—Tipperary Improvement Scheme, Rejection of Application.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 618.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*
  Traction Engines, Damage to roads by—Compelling Owners to repair or contribute towards up-keep of Roads.
    Q. Oct. 27, 801.
  Travelling Post Offices—Officers' Risk Allowances—Delay in payment of Arrears.
    Q. Oct. 29, 1060.
  Tullamore Gaol—Prisoners sentenced under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act—Number sentenced to Hard Labour, Dietary, etc.
    Q. Oct. 21, 355.
  United Irish League, *see* that title.
  United States and Ireland—President Roosevelt's Message of Sympathy to the United Irish League.
    Qs. Oct. 22, 490, 491.
  Wexford, South—Damage to Roads by Traction Engines—Compelling Owners to repair or Contribute towards up-keep of Roads.
    Q. Oct. 27, 801.
  Waterford—*see* that title.
  White Estate, Delay in Sale to Tenants.
    Q. Oct. 23, 601.

Irish Nationalist Parliamentary Party
  Funds of the Party—Obstructive Activity in the House chief Means of raising Funds.
    O. Mr. Sloan, *Oct. 23*, 693.
  Imprisonment of Irish Members.
    Communication to the Speaker, *Oct. 16*, 12 ; *Oct. 20*, 201 ; *Oct. 27*, 789 ; *Oct. 30*, 1181.
      Q. Oct. 20, 231, 234.
      Instructions to Magistrates.
        Q. Oct. 23, 622 ; *Oct. 27*, 824.
      Omission of Custom at the instance of the Executive Government, and suppression of Letters at Dublin Castle, alleged
        Q. Oct. 20, 232, 233.
      see also subheading Withdrawal of Members.
    Debate on Motion for Precedence of Government Business, Oct. 16, 64, 69, 79.
    Hard Labour—Bread and Water Diet, etc.
      Qs. Oct. 20, 237 ; *Oct. 21*, 355.
    Nationalist Appreciation and Admiraation of Mr. Reddy—Motion proposed, *Oct. 20*, 249.
    Number imprisoned between Aug. 8th and Oct. 20th, 1902.—Names, Terms of Imprisonment, etc.
      Q. Oct. 20, 231, 233, 235.
    O'Flanagan, Mr., Case of, *see* O'Flanagan.
    Speeches — Number of Members imprisoned for Political Speeches during past year.
      Q. Oct. 20, 237.

Irish Nationalist Parliamentary Party—*cont.*
  Imprisonment of Irish Members—*cont.*
    Withdrawal of Members from the Service of the House by sentence of Courts of Law without communication to the House by the Speaker.
      Os. Mr. J. Morley, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Oct. 16*, 65 ; Mr Power, 77.
      Qs. Oct. 20, 201, 220.
      Privilege—Breach of, alleged—Speaker's Ruling that it was not a Breach of Privilege, *Oct. 16*, 13, 14.
    see also Names of Members.
  Opportunity for Discussion of Irish grievances—Mr. Balfour's Statement that it was not in accordance with the Practice of the House to grant a day for a Vote of Censure except on demand of the Opposition, *Oct. 16*, 27, 28 ; *Oct. 20*, 246 ; *Oct. 22*, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489 ; *Oct. 23*, 631, 632, 633.
    Observations on the Motion for Precedence of Government Business, Oct. 16, 53, 56, 74, 79.
  Questions asked in the House on behalf of absent Members—Personal Explanation by Mr. Tully, *Oct. 29*, 1079 ; *Oct. 30*, 1195.
  Section—Objections to the term Section, The Irish were a distinct Party.
    Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Condon, Mr. A. J Balfour. *Oct 22*, 485 ; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. A. J. Balfour, 487.

Irish People
  Dublin, City of, Proclaimed under the Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1877, to enable the Government to deal with the *Irish People* Newspaper.
    O. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 27*, 900.

Iron Ore
  United States Industry — Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

"Islay," S.S.
  Stranding, Cause of—Delay in lowering Boats alleged.
    Q. Oct. 23, 597.

Italy.
  France and Italy, Agreement between with reference to the *status quo* in the Mediterranean, alleged.
    Q. Oct. 23, 608.
  Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17 ; *Nov. 3*, 1375.

Jacoby, Mr. J. A. [Derbyshire, Mid]
  Military Rides on the Continent—Participation of British Officers in the Brussels to Ostend Ride, Sanction for—Preventing Officers competing in future, *Oct. 20*, 213.

Japan
  Trade Report Presented *Oct. 16*, 1, 2, 17 ; *Nov. 3*, 1375.

Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. A. F., *Deputy Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means* (Hants. N.)
Proposal to make Expiring Laws into Permanent Acts of Parliament which was not within the Scope of the Bill, *Oct. 22*, 553, 554.

Jews
Treatment of Jews in Roumania—American Note, Publication of Correspondence—Opportunity for discussion.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 219.

Johnstone, Mr. J. Heywood [Sussex, Horsham]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 28*, 1006.

Joicey, Sir J. [Durham, Chester-le-Street]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 21*, 417 ; *Oct. 28*, 1006.

Jones, Mr. D. B. [Swansea District]
Customs Department—Grievances of Examining Officers—Date of Communicating Proposal to Officers, *Oct. 24*, 727.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 22*, 493 ; *Nov. 3*, 1410.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 2R, *Oct. 21*, 459.
Ireland.
  Cork Steamship Service—Subsidy to the Clyde Shipping Company granted by Congested Districts Board, Refusal of similar Subsidy to competing Port of Limerick, *Oct. 20*, 231.
  Limerick.
    Conduct of Police in removing Notices of Public Meeting, *Oct. 20*, 209.
    Post Office—Punishment of Staff, Re-consideration of, proposed—Custody of Safe, *Oct. 27*, 827.
    Postmastership, Appointment of Irish Roman Catholic, proposed, *Oct. 20*, 230.
  Railways, Goods Rates—High Rate of Charge from Newcastle West, via Waterford to Liverpool, etc.—Facilitating transit of Irish Produce to the English Market, *Oct. 27*, 817.

Judges, Ireland
County Court Judges, *see* that title.

Judicial Rents, Ireland
Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 20.

Jury-Packing, Ireland
Sullivan, Sergeant, Trial of at Sligo—Charge of Jury-packing against the Government.
Debate on Motion for Adjournment, Oct. 20, 314, 323, 334, 335.

Kanturk and Newmarket Railway
Traffic Arrangements, Complaints by Merchants and Traders of the District.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1077.

Keegan, Michael
Swords Borough School Scholarship, Mr. Keegan disqualified by Examiners—Referring matter to National Board of Education.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1077.

Kelly, James
Sullivan, Sergeant, Charges against—Kelly, Sullivan's intended victim.
O. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 20*, 311.

Kelly, Mr. P. J.
Hard Labour Sentences, Disqualification from service on public boards entailed by—Mr. Kelly's alleged statement.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1063.

Kemp, Mr. G. [Lancashire, Heywood]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 27*, 853.

Kenmare Port, Ireland
Claims for Assistance under the Marine Works (Ireland) Act—Consideration of Claims.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 354.

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. K. [Devon, Honiton]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 31*, 1346.

Kennedy, Mr. P. J. [Westmeath, N.]
Ireland.
  Athlone Income Tax Appeals, Number lodged — Dissatisfaction at increase on Assessments, *Nov. 3*, 1384.
  Railway Rates for Coal, Reduction of—Revision of Canal Tolls proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1387.

Kent, County of
Parliamentary By-Election—New Member sworn for Western or Sevenoaks Division, *Oct. 16*, 15.

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. [Shropshire, Newport]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 30*, 1303, 1304 ; *Oct. 31*, 1311, 1312.

Kerry
Fisheries — Estimates for a Slip at Coomenaum submitted by Surveyor of the Kerry County Council, Rejection by Congested Districts Board.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 818.
Historic Relics, Removal of, from Irishvickillane by the Irish Lights Board.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1065.
Rae Estate—Receiver's Accounts, Furnishing copy to Mr. Rae, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1065.

Kilfree
Postal Service, Improvement in, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 798.

Kilmallock
Labourers' Cottages Scheme — Patrick Hayes' Refusal to allow entry on his lands.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1187.

King Edward
Progress through London on Oct. 25.
Bank Holiday Proclamation.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 222.
Telegraphists—Granting same concessions to London Telegraphists as on Coronation Day.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 473.

King, Sir H. S. [Hull, Central.]
Afghanistan.
Purchase of Arms, etc., in Germany—Landing at Kurrachee and Conveyance across British Territory, Consistence with Agreement between Afghan and British Government, *Oct. 20*, 205.
Russia and Afghanistan, Establishment of Direct Relations between.
Diplomatic Communications, *Oct. 20*, 208.
Discussion in the House, Opportunity prior to Arrangement between British and Russian Governments, *Oct. 31*, 1309.
Laying Communications between Russian and British Governments on the Table of the House, *Oct. 27*, 794.
India.
Documents—Public Sale of Government Confidential Documents, Prevention of in future, *Oct. 20*, 204.
Volunteers at the Coronation—Government Employees receiving no Pay for extra period of their detention, owing to the King's illness, *Oct. 22*, 462.
King's Progress through London on October 25th—Bank Holiday Proclamation, *Oct. 20*, 222.
Parcel Post to the United States, Arrangements with the American Express Company—Protection of the British Post Office from Loss, *Nov. 3*, 1385.

Kish Lightship
Defect in system of warning Vessels, "Leinster" Casualty—Steps taken to render system effective.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 207.

Labouchere, Mr. H. [Northampton.]
Bushey Park—Sale of Portion of Park to the United Tramways Company, *Oct. 30*, 1186.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 27*, 868.

Labour
Hours of Labour of Railway Employees, Return—Date of Presentation.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 598.
Reduction of proposed.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1074.

Labourers' Cottages, Ireland
Cork Rural District Scheme, Refusal to sanction.
Qs. *Oct. 23*, 618; *Oct. 27*, 821.
Kilmallock Scheme—Patrick Hayes' Refusal to allow entry on his lands.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1187.
Lisburn Scheme—Delay in communicating Report of Local Government Board Inspector to the District Council.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1065.
Macroom Union—W. Creedon's application for Cottage.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 476.
Skibbereen Rural District Council application for Loan.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1078.

Labourers, Ireland
Allotments for—Tipperary Improvement Scheme, Rejection of Applications.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 618.
Housing of—Legislation, Government intentions during present Session.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 617.

Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1860
Exclusion from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed.
Os. Mr. O'Shee, *Oct. 22*, 558; Mr. Atkinson, 559.

Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill
Facilities for discussion.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1063.

Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment (No. 2) Bill
Facilities for introduction.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 617.

Ladysmith, Siege of
Gun Carriage of H.M.S. "Terrible." Designer of.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 224.
Placing in Museum, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 939.

Lagos
Lifeboat sent out to the Government—Condemnation on arrival alleged.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 219.
Spirits, Importation of over-proof spirits—Legislation proposed.
Q. *Nov 3*, 1389.

Lambert, Mr. G. [Devonshire, South Molton.]
Delagoa Bay—Negotiations to Secure British Management for Harbour and Railway, *Nov. 3*, 1394.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 30*, 1233.

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill.
c. 3R*, *Oct. 20*, 202.
l. 1R*, *Nov. 3*, 1373.

Land Commission, Ireland
Abolition of, proposed
O. Mr. Tully, *Oct 27*, 913.
Clonmel, Cashel, Clogheen and Thurles Unions—Hearing of Appeals at Clonmel proposed,
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1062.
Court Valuers—Opportunities for forming opinions as to Fair Rents of Holdings compared with Sub-Commissioners, &c.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1064.
Proceedings—Return Presented, *Oct. 23*, 592; *Nov. 3*, 1375, 1376.
Rae Estate, Delay in Sale to Tenants.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 483.
Returns Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 20.
White Estate, Delay in Sale to Tenants.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 601.

Land Judges Court Ireland
Valuers, Opportunities for forming opinions as to Fair Rents of Holdings compared with Sub-Commissioners, &c.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1064.

Land Purchase Acts (Ireland) Bill
c 2R Bill Withdrawn, *Oct. 20*, 341.

Land Question, Ireland
Conference between Representatives of Tenants' Combination and Landowners' Convention, proposed—Mr. Wyndham's approval, Rejection of Proposals by Landowners' Convention, etc.
Os. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 27*. 892.
Settlement
Boycotting and Intimidation, Effect in postponing Settlement.
O. Mr. Wyndham, *Oct. 27*, 917.
Funds required to be obtained by Abolition of Land Commission, proposed.
O. Mr. Tully, *Oct. 27*, 913.
Government Inability to settle Land Question. "It must be settled by the parties interested"—Mr. Wyndham's Statement.
Os. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 27*, 891; Mr. Wyndham, 927.
Various and Contradictory Proposals of Subdivisions of Irish Parties.
O. Mr. Wyndham, Oct. 27, 916.
Westport Rural District Council Recommendations.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1402.

Lands Valuation (Scotland) Amendment Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, *Oct. 16*, 135.

Langley, Mr. Batty [Sheffield, Attercliffe]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 28*, 1023.

Law, Mr. H. [Donegal, W.]
Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Oct. 22*, 552.
Cyprus, Archbishopric of — Delay in appointing successor to Monsignor Sophronius, *Oct. 29*, 1068.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 22*, 578.

Law Courts.
Ireland—Chancery Division—Pension of Registrar, Treasury Minute Presented *Oct. 30*, 1182; *Oct. 31*, 1306.
Supreme Court of Jurdicature—Account of Receipts and Payments for the Year ending Feb. 28, 1901, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 22.

Lawrence, Mr. W. F. [Liverpool, Abercomby]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 29*, 1115.
Sierra Leone Railway Material—Allowing the Public to Tender for, proposed, *Oct. 29*, 1070.

Lawson, Mr. J. Grant—*Secretary to the Local Government Board* [York, N.R., Thirsk]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Oct. 24*, 769.
Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament) Bill, 2R., *Oct.* 21, 447.

Lead Mines
Night work by Young Persons—Exemption Order Presented, *Oct.* 16, 10, 24.

Lead Poisoning
Local Government Report Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1376, 1380.

Leamy, Mr. E. [Kildare, N.]
Ireland
Condition of—Injustice of Refusing Opportunity for Discussion of Irish Grievances, *Oct. 16*, 62.
Nationalist Members, Number imprisoned for Political Speeches during past year—Number sentenced to Hard Labour, Dietary, etc., *Oct. 20*, 237.

Leek
Post Office—Date of commencing building of new Post Office.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 798.

Leenane
Post Office—Religious Tests for Employees.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 473.

Leese, Sir J. [Lancashire, Accrington]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 17*, 161; *Oct. 21*, 396; *Oct. 23*, 650; *Oct. 24*, 744; *Oct. 28*, 955.

Legge, Col. H. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
- Army—Promotion Claims of Re-employed and Reserve Officers of Regiments serving at home during the South African War, *Oct. 27*, 801.

Lehud
- Fishing Harbour, Improvement of—Congested Districts Board contributing towards Cost.
  Q. *Oct. 23*, 599.

Leicester
- Census—Return Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1377, 1380.
- Technical Instruction—Minutes sanctioning Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act Presented, *Oct. 23*, 592; *Nov. 3*, 1378.

Leitrim
- Assizes, White Glove Calendar—Withdrawal of Proclamation under the Crimes Act, proposed.
  Q. *Nov. 3*, 1403.

Leng, Sir J. [Dundee]
- Canada.
  - Postage Rates between Great Britain and Canada, Lowering Rates, proposed, *Oct. 28*, 948.
  - Store Cattle, Healthiness of, Abrogation of embargo on sale in English and Scottish Markets, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1397.
- Scotland — Telegraphic Communication with England—Furthest point to which Underground Wires have been laid down, Establishment of Marconi System, proposed, *Oct 27*, 810.
- Silver Coronation Medals issued to heads of Municipalities, Number and Cost of, *Nov. 3*, 1395.
- South African War—Irregular Forces, Troopers killed in the War, Pensions to Relatives—Case of Mrs. Mackenzie, *Oct. 29*, 1071.

Levy, Mr. M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 28*, 954; *Oct. 29*, 1091, 1092.
- Gibraltar Dock-Labourers' Strike — Soldiers and Police unloading Vessels trading in the interest of Private Owners, alleged, Sanction for, *Oct. 20*, 218.
- Gun Accident at Portsmouth, Inquiry into death of Seaman Cosham—Number of Accidents during last ten years, *Nov. 3*, 1383.

Lewes
- Naval Prison, Condemnation of, as unfit for use, alleged—Continued use.
  Q. *Oct. 20*, 206.

Lewis, Island of
- Crofters and Cottars.
  - Number in the Island at time of passing of the Crofters Act.
    Q. *Oct. 29*, 1075.
  - Report by Crofters Commission on Social Condition of the People, Presented, *Oct. 22*, 462; *Nov. 3*, 1374.
  - Small Holdings Scheme—Establishment of by the Congested Districts Board, proposed.
    Qs. *Oct. 23*, 613; *Oct. 29*, 1075.
- Ness.
  - Death from Typhus.
    - Insanitary Condition of house in which Mackay died—Public Health Authorities refraining from removing Patient.
      Q. *Oct. 27*, 796.
    - Interment Arrangements, Providing Isolation Hospital for District.
      Q. *Oct. 22*, 474.
  - Harbour—Report on Condition of, Date of issue.
    Q. *Nov. 3*, 1400.
- Public Health—Date of last visit of Local Government Board Inspector.
  Q. *Nov. 3*, 1381.
- Sanitary Condition of—Appointment of Local Government Inspector, proposed.
  Q. *Nov. 3*, 1399.
- Schools—Children providing Peats for Class Room Fires—Disregard of Circular issued by Scottish Education Department abolishing Custom.
  Q. *Oct. 21*, 354.
- Steamship Subsidy—Congested Districts Board granting Subsidy to facilitate Transit of Fish, proposed.
  Q. *Oct. 28*, 950.
- Swordle, Proposed Fishing Harbour—Refusal of Assistance by Congested Districts Board.
  Q. *Oct. 30*, 1184.

Lewis, Mr. Herbert [Flint Boroughs]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 21*, 361; *Oct. 22*, 535; *Oct. 28*, 959, 962, 975, 976; *Oct. 29*, 1127; *Oct. 30*, 1278, 1279, 1283, 1286; *Nov. 3*, 1418, 1476.
  - Furniture, Holidays, Prizes, etc., Control of Local Authority over, *Oct. 30*, 596.
  - Pupil Teacherships in Voluntary Schools, Public Notification of Vacancies, *Oct. 31*, 1310.
  - Voluntary Schools — Trust Deeds, Copies of Precedents—Date of Laying on the Table of the House, *Oct. 24*, 726.

Liberia
- Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 1, 17.

Licensing Act, 1902.
- Home Office Regulations for guidance of Police Authorities.
  Q. *Oct. 23*, 597.

Light Load Line Committee

Adjournment of Sittings until next Session, proposed.
Os. Earl Spencer, Duke of Devonshire, *Oct. 16*, 11.

Lights and Lighthouses

Accounts of Lighthouse Authorities—Date of Presentation of Annual Account, etc.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 598.

Braunton Lighthouse, Connecting with the Telephone—Provision of Money.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 795.

Cape Guardafui, Establishment of Lighthouse proposed.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1073.

Ireland.

Kish Lightship—Defect in System of warning Vessels, "Leinster" Casualty—Steps taken to improve System.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 207.

Strangford Lough Lighthouse being without Light or Beacon—Wreck of the "William Bailey."
Q. *Oct. 27*, 795.

Scotland — Avoch, Scheme for lighting Channel, Carrying into Effect.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 794.

Lights Board, Ireland

Constitution of Board—Legislation.
Qs. *Oct. 20*, 207 ; *Oct. 27*, 795.

Limerick

Constabulary, Royal Irish—Conduct in removing Notices of Public Meeting.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 209.

Postmastership, Appointment of Irish Roman Catholic, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 230.

Post Office—Punishment of Staff; Reconsideration of, proposed—Custody of Safe.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 827.

Typhoid Fever—Report of Medical Inspectors Presented, *Oct. 24*, 726 ; *Nov. 3*, 1375.

Lincoln, County of

Census—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 21.

Liquids

Carriage of Inflammable Liquids on Railways—Attitude of Managers, etc.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1384.

Liquor Traffic and Liquor Licensing Laws

Scotland—Legislation during present Session—Government Intentions.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 938.

Lisburn

Labourers' Cottages Scheme — Delay in communicating Report of Local Government Board Inspector to the District Council.
Q. *Oct 29* 1065

Liscannor Harbour, Ireland

Marine Works (Ireland) Bill—Date of carrying out Provisions with respect to Liscannor Harbour.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 209.

Liverpool, Borough of

Parliamentary By-Election — New Writ for East Toxteth Division, *Oct. 28*, 937.

Llewellyn, Mr. E. H. [Somerset, N.]

Somaliland, British Military Operations—Retirement of Col. Swayne, Information as to Casualties, *Oct. 20*, 223.

Lloyd-George, Mr. D. [Carnarvon, etc.]

Cunard Company Subsidy—Opportunity for Discussion, *Oct. 16*, 43.

Education [England and Wales] Bill, *com.* *Oct. 16*, 97, 111, 113, 114, 127, 128, 129, 130 ; *Oct. 17*, 154, 156, 167, 180, 182 ; *Oct. 20*, 253, 254, 264, 290, 299 ; *Oct. 21*, 368, 369, 380, 381, 382, 414, 415 ; *Oct. 22*, 494, 498, 516, 517, 544, 545 ; *Oct. 23*, 647, 657, 674, 676, 718, 731, 748, 749 ; *Oct. 24*, 759, 767, 768, 769, 770, 777, 786 ; *Oct. 27*, 869, 870, 871 ; *Oct. 28*, 953, 959, 961, 962, 963, 976, 985, 1008, 1040 ; *Oct. 29*, 1093, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1104, 1105, 1134, 1136 ; *Oct. 29*, 1162, 1163 ; *Oct. 30*, 1198, 1204, 1272, 1280, 1286, 1293, 1296, 1298; *Oct. 31*, 1362, 1365 ; *Nov 3*, 1409, 1422, 1442, 1443, 1444, 1474, 1497, 1499.

Precedence for discussion of a Bill which nobody wanted and for which the Government had no mandate, *Oct. 16*, 43, 50.

Transvaal, Vote for — Opportunity for discussion, *Oct. 16*, 43.

Loans

India—Loans raised in England chargeable on the Revenues of India—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 23.

Repayment, Term of—Carrying out Report of Select Committee.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 808.

Transvaal Loan, Date of introducing Bill—Purposes to which proceeds of Loan are to be applied.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 472.

Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament Bill

c. 2R. *Oct. 21*, 447.

Date of taking.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1407.

Local Government Board

President—Rt. Hon. W. H. Long.

Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. J. Grant Lawson.

Annual Report Presented, *Nov.* 3, 1376, 1380.

Local Government Board, Ireland
Employees—Conditions of Service, Regulations as to devotion of entire time to duties of Office—Case of Mr. T. P. Nolan acting as Handwriting Expert.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 211 ; *Oct. 27*, 813.

Local Government (Ireland) Bill.
Date of taking.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1407.
Facilities for discussion.
Qs. *Oct. 27*, 828 ; *Nov. 3*, 1403.

Local Records
Collection and Custody of—Report of Committee Presented, *Oct. 29*, 1057 ; *Oct. 30*, 1182.

Local Taxation (Scotland) Account
Annual Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 20.

Locomotives Act, 1865
Exclusion from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed — Provisions of Act, etc.
Debate on Second Reading of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Oct. 22, 560, 561.

Loder, Mr. G. W. E. [Brighton]
Volunteer Artillery Armament, Placing Heavy Batteries on a Footing of Efficiency—Horsing 15-pounder B.L. Guns as R.F.A. Guns, etc., *Nov. 3*, 1388.

Logan, Mr. J. W. [Leicester, Harborough].
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 28*, 1010.

London
Crime in—Central Criminal Court Calendar, Number of Persons charged with Murder, etc.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 612.

London, Port of
Report of Royal Commission, Board of Trade proposed Action.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 599.

London Elections Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, *Oct. 16*, 135.

London United Electric Railways Bill
c. Report,* *Oct. 21*, 345.
Motion to Re-commit Bill, *Oct. 27*, 791.

Londonderry, Marquess of
Education—Criticism of Appointment of the Marquess of Londonderry as President of the Board of Education.
Q. Mr. S. Evans, *Oct 21*, 403.

Long, Rt. Hon. Walter—*President of the Local Government Board* [Bristol, S.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 24*, 762, 763, 764, 766, 770, 771.
Housing of the Working Classes Loans—Term of Repayment, Carrying out Report of Select Committee, *Oct. 27*, 808.

Long, Rt. Hon. Walter—*cont.*
Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament) Bill, 2R, *Oct. 21*, 453.
Motor Cars.
Regulations as to Speed, etc., Legislation, *Oct. 27*, 809.

Lonsdale, Earl of
Remounts—Authority for Employment of Earl of Lonsdale.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 465.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid]
Ireland.
Agricultural Statistics for year ending Mar. 31, 1902—Delay in Publication of Report of Board of Agriculture, *Oct. 23*, 601.
Arms and Ammunition imported from Birmingham—Provisions of Peace Preservation Act of 1881, *Nov. 3*, 1400.

Lord Advocate for Scotland
Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray.

Lord Chancellor
Earl of Halsbury.

Lord Chancellor of Ireland
Lord Ashbourne.

Lord Chief Justice of England
Baron Alverstone.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl of Dudley.
Allowance, Supplementary Vote for.
Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Oct. 16*, 30.

Lord President of the Council
Duke of Devonshire.

Lorries
Army—Report on trials of Self-propelled Lorries, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 19.

Lough, Mr. T. [Islington, W.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 190, 196 ; *Oct. 23*, 708 ; *Oct. 29*, 1161, 1168 ; *Nov. 3*, 1414, 1415, 1497.
Ireland, Condition of—Opportunity for Discussion of Irish Grievances, *Oct. 16*, 72, 74.
Postmen—Number prosecuted and dismissed since Jan. 1, 1901—Amount of weekly wages, etc., *Oct. 29*, 1059.
Savings Banks Funds, Carrying out Recommendations of Select Committee—Opportunity for Discussion, *Oct. 20*, 227.
Sugar Bounties Convention.
Legislation prior to Ratification in Feb., 1903, *Nov. 3*, 1404.

[*cont.*

Lough, Mr. T.—*cont.*
- Sugar Bounties Convention—*cont.*
  - Sanction by Parliament—Adequate time for Discussion of Resolution, *Oct. 27*, 829.
  - Transvaal Vote, Date of taking, *Nov. 3*, 1406.

Lowther, Mr. Claude [Cumberland, Eskdale]
- Transvaal and Orange River Colonies Contributions to the Cost of the War—Amount fixed, *Oct. 20*, 217.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. James [Kent, Thanet]
- Irish Nationalist Members — Imprisonment under Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, Communications to Mr. Speaker, *Oct. 20*, 234.
- Piccadilly, City, and North-East London Railways Bill, *re-com.*, *Oct. 29*, 1154.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W. — *Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means* [Cumberland, Penrith]
- Bills.
  - Amendments in the wrong place, *Oct. 23*, 667; *Oct. 30*, 1198.
  - Amendments [Education (England and Wales) Bill, etc.]
    - Amendments out of order, *Oct. 17*, 176; *Oct. 20*, 253; *Oct. 29*, 1159, 1160; *Oct. 30*, 1197, 1198, 1217, 1219, 1280; *Nov. 3*, 1413, 1414.
    - Amendments had already been provided for by words inserted in another Clause, *Oct. 21*, 361, 381, 409; *Oct. 22*, 495, 497; *Oct. 23*, 665, 716, 724; *Oct. 24*, 728, 747, 759.
    - Consequential Amendment, *Oct. 21*, 361, 409.
    - Defining the conditions under which a school should be kept alive and then to propose as a first condition that it should cease to exist, *Oct. 22*, 494.
    - Interpretation of words "all" and "necessary"—The matter had already been discussed and decided, *Oct. 20*, 253, 254.
    - Negativing what had gone before, *Oct. 22*, 493.
    - Point already disposed of, *Oct. 17*, 142; *Oct. 20*, 253; *Oct. 29*, 1124; *Nov. 3*, 1413, 1414, 1415.
      - "Teachers" Clause including "Assistant" Teachers and "Pupil" Teachers, *Oct. 30*, 1280, 1281, 1283.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.—*cont.*
- Bills—*cont.*
  - Amendments—*cont.*
    - Point which should be raised upon another Clause, *Oct. 21*, 361.
    - Point not covered by the Amendment, *Oct. 22*, 513, 514.
    - Schedules.
      - Amendments which should come as a Schedule, *Oct. 23*, 667.
      - If the Amendment was dealt with, then the matter could not be dealt with when the Committee came to the Schedule, *Oct. 22*, 549.
  - Objecting to Amendment after it had been put from the Chair—If the Amendment were accepted the Bill would probably be referred to Examiners of Private Bills to see whether the Articles had been complied with, *Oct. 30*, 1268.
  - Separate Amendment—Amendment which ought to come up as a Separate Amendment, *Oct. 22*, 497.
  - Discussing Clause on Motion that the Clause should not be discussed—The Member should give reasons why the Clause should not be discussed and the reasons should be so put as not to lead to a Discussion, *Oct. 16*, 117.
  - Member in charge of a Bill always took Precedence in moving Amendments, *Oct. 23*, 967.
  - Premature discussions—The Member was not entitled to take the cream off all the Amendments, *Oct. 16*, 132.
- "Control" and "Sole Control," difference between, *Oct. 20*, 296.
- Divisions.
  - Closure Division — Mistake in the figures, *Oct. 24*, 774.
  - Member (Mr. Tully) complained that he had not been counted, *Oct. 31*, 1361.
- Irrelevant Observations — Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Oct. 17*, 147, 148, 149, 150, 196; *Oct. 21*, 373; *Oct. 22*, 538; *Oct. 24*, 738, 740; *Oct. 29*, 1096, 1098, 1138; *Oct. 31*, 1345, 1357.
  - Managers, Relations of, with the Local Authority—Discussion on Motion for postponement of Clause 8, *Oct. 16*, 124, 125, 126.
  - Postponement of Clause of Bill, etc., *Oct. 16*, 124, 125, 126.

[*cont.*

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.—*cont.*
- Irrevalent Observations—*cont.*
  - Raising Points which were covered by Amendments at a later stage, *Oct. 16*, 132; *Oct. 17*, 160, 161.
  - Scope of a subsequent Amendment—All the Chairman had to decide was whether the discussion was relevant to the Amendment before the Committee, *Oct. 17*, 161.
- Putting the Question—Striking out words in sub-Section of Clause before putting the Question would be contrary to the usual Custom — The Custom had grown up, and it was a very proper one, of putting the Question in such a way that if the Question was defeated the right of Members to discuss the subsequent words remained—If the views of the Members were accepted the Custom would have to go by the board, which would be very undesirable, as the Custom was really a Safeguard, *Oct. 24*, 778.
- Trust deed — Contention that a Trust deed was of more importance than an Act of Parliament, *Oct. 27*, 883.

Loyd, Mr. A. K. [Berkshire, Abingdon]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 28*, 1055.
- Poor Law Officers' Superannuation, Establishment of Central Fund, proposed, *Oct. 21*, 348.

Lucas, Mr. R. [Portsmouth]
- China — British Military Operations in 1900 — Gratuities for the Forces, *Oct. 23*, 596.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 27*, 876; *Oct. 30*, 1291.
- Motor Cars—Certificate of Efficiency—Requiring Driver to possess Certificate, proposed, *Oct. 28*, 939.
- Pensions to Widows of Seamen killed on Duty, Devoting portion of the Patriotic Fund to—Relieving Greenwich Hospital Fund, *Oct. 20*, 221.
- "Terrible," H.M.S.—Gun-carriage used at Siege of Ladysmith, Placing in Public Museum, proposed, *Oct. 28*, 939.

Lunacy
- Ireland—Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 19.

Lunatic Asylums
- Return.
  - *Q. Oct. 28*, 942.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
- Ireland.
  - Hospital Roads, Condition of—Neglect as to Repairs, *Oct. 22*, 476.
  - Killmallock Labourers' Cottages Scheme — Patrick Hayes' Refusal to allow entry on his lands, *Oct. 30*, 1187.

Lurgan
- Post Office—Date of commencing new Building.
  - *Q. Nov. 3*, 1385.

Lyons
- Chemical and Metal Industries—Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

McArthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool, Exchange]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 143; *Oct. 23*, 651; *Oct. 29*, 1118; *Nov. 3*, 1476.
- Lighthouse Authorities Accounts—Date of Presentation of Annual Accounts, etc., *Oct. 23*, 598.
- Marine Insurance Bill, Re-introduction of, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 828.
- Prayer Book, Alterations from the Authorised Text in a recent Edition, Authority for, *Oct. 27*, 808; *Oct. 28*, 942.

Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. E. [Antrim, S.E.]
- Ireland.
  - Belfast—Postal Arrangements, Delay in the Delivery of Letters, *Oct. 27*, 797.
  - Lisburn Labourers' Cottages Scheme —Delay in communicating Inspector's Report to the District Council, *Oct. 29*, 1065.
  - Swords Borough School Scholarship —M. Keegan disqualified by Examiners, *Oct. 29*, 1077.

McCloskey *v.* Holmes
- Defraying Expenses of District-Inspector Holmes—Dismissal of charge at Strabane Petty Sessions.
  - *Q. Oct 27*, 823.

M'Connachie Brothers
- Contract for supplying Tinned Rations to the Troops in South Africa, Number of Tins rejected—Fair Wage Clause in Contract.
  - *Q. Oct. 28*, 941.

M'Crae, Mr. G. [Edinburgh, E.]
- South African War.
  - Cost of the War—Total Expenditure, *Oct. 23*, 607.
  - Terminal Charges—Authority for Expenditure. *Nov. 3*, 1394.

M'Hale, Mr.
- Sullivan, Sergeant, charges against.
  - Forged Letter inciting to Outrage, purporting to come from Mr. M'Hale.
    - *Debate on Motion for Adjournment, Oct. 20*, 311.
  - Libel Action against Sullivan in Dublin brought by Mr. M'Hale—Mr. M'Hale financed by Mr. W. O'Brien.
    - *Os.* Mr. Atkinson, *Oct. 20* 325; Mr. W. O'Brien, 326.

[*cont.*

M'Hale, Mr.—*cont.*
- Sullivan, Sergeant, charges against—*cont.*
  - Shorthand Writer's Report of Civil Action, Laying on the Table of the House, proposed. *Q. Oct. 27*, 825.

M'Hugh, Mr. P. A.
- Imprisonment of—Communication to the Speaker, *Oct. 20*, 201; *Oct. 30*, 1181.

MacIver, Mr. D. [Liverpool, Kirkdale]
- Army—Certificates of Character, Post Office Authorities calling on Staff returning from the Front to produce Certificates—Rule alleged, forbidding Men to part with Certificates, *Oct. 22*, 464.

MacIver, Sir L. [Edinburgh, W.]
- Piccadilly, City, and North-Eastern Railways Bill *re-com. Oct. 29*, 1155.

McKenna, Mr. R. [Monmouth, N.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 16*, 115, 117, 130, 131, *Oct. 17*, 143, 150, 171, 176, 184, 189, 193; *Oct. 20*, 254, 268, 270, 286, 287, 295, 296, 297, 300; *Oct. 21*, 375, 379, 396, 397, 421; *Oct. 22*, 498, 519, 520, 533, 540,; *Oct. 23*, 644, 650, 654, 656, 657, 680, 709, 719; *Oct. 24*, 736, 763; *Oct. 27*, 863; *Oct. 28*, 963, 967, 992, 1035, 1042; *Oct. 29*, 1089, 1103, 1159, 1161; *Oct. 31*, 1366; *Nov. 3*, 1408, 1415, 1454, 1461, 1462, 1471, 1473.

Mackenzie, Mrs.
- South African War, Death of Sons—Pension Claim. *Q. Oct. 29*, 1071.

McLaren, Sir C. B. [Leicester, Bosworth]
- Abertysswg Colliery Explosion, Gallantry of Miners—Recognition of, by awards of Albert Medal, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1396.
- Army Reservists' Grievances.
  - Arrears of Pay, *Oct. 23*, 603.
  - London Public Meeting—Steps taken to remove Grievances, *Oct. 20*, 212.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J. [Camberwell, N.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 16*, 124, 125, 126; *Oct. 17*, 142, 143, 152; *Oct. 20*, 262, 280, 283, 295, 300; *Oct, 21*, 364, 398, 412, 416; *Oct. 22*, 537; *Oct. 23*, 641, 642, 654, 664, 665, 666, 677, 715, 722; *Oct. 24*, 746, 747, 760, 770, 771; *Oct. 27*, 858, 873, 887, 888; *Oct. 28*, 997, 1007, 1010, 1024, 1030, 1031, 1032, 1034, 1045, 1048, 1052, 1053; *Oct 29*, 1091, 1092, 1112, 1123, 1160, 1166; *Oct. 30*, 1248; *Nov. 3*, 1413, 1414, 1418, 1434, 1435, 1436, 1438, 1459, 1461, 1475, 1487.
- Employment of Children Bill—Date of Re-introduction, *Oct. 27*, 829.

MacNeill, Mr. Swift [Donegal, S.]
- Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act.
  - Courts, Constitution of—Number of Attendances by Mr. Harrell, *Oct. 27*, 822.
  - Hard Labour Sentences, Number of, *Oct. 20*, 236.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *com. Oct. 22*, 570.
- Ireland.
  - Constabulary, Royal Irish.
    - Anderson, Sergeant.
      - Retention in the Force—Charges of Perjury against, *Oct. 23*, 627, 633, 634, 635.
      - Nature of Duties, *Oct. 27*, 822.
    - Promotions, System of, grounded on the success of Prosecutions, alleged, *Oct 23*, 628.
    - Sullivan, Sergeant.
      - Accomplice of Ex-Sergeant Sheridan—Retention in Force, *Oct. 20*, 236, 237.
      - Charges against, *Oct. 20*, 323, 332.
  - Lord Lieutenant's Allowance, Supplementary Vote, *Oct. 16*, 30.
- Irish Nationalist Members, Imprisonment of, under Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act.
  - Non-Communication to the Speaker, *Oct. 16*, 13, 14, 15; *Oct. 20*, 201.
  - Number between August 8 and October 20, 1902, Names, Terms of Imprisonment, etc.—Magistrates neglecting to communicate fact to the Speaker, Charges against the Executive Government of suppressing Letters, etc., *Oct. 20*, 231, 232, 233, 234.
- Irish Nationalist Parliamentary Party, Distinct Party, not a Section, *Oct. 22*, 485.
- Parliament, Members of—One Law for British and another for Irish Members, *Oct. 16*, 14.
- Privilege—Mr. Moore's Question on the Paper addressed to the Home Secretary relating to the Precedence of the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, *Oct. 23*, 589, 590.
- Questions in the House — Answers to Questions left over when the Time Limit is reached, *Oct. 20*, 246.

Macroom Union
- Creedon's, W., Application for Cottage. *Q. Oct. 22*, 476.

McVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
Division, Interruption of—Power of the Chair to put a Motion for Suspension of a Member during Division on another Question, *Oct. 16*, 82.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *com. Oct. 22*, 579.
Hard Labour Sentences, Disqualification from Service on public boards, entailed by—Mr. P. J. Kelly's alleged statement, *Oct. 29*, 1063.

Ireland.
  Anderson, Sergeant—Irish Government Refusal to Discharge, *Oct. 23*, 634.
  Belfast, Sunday Disturbances on Custom House Steps.
    Anti-Catholic diatribes of Speakers at Meetings, etc , *Oct. 23*, 697, 698, 699.
    Collection of Money, Prohibition of proposed, *Oct. 27*, 812.
  Down, County, Court Houses, Use of for Political Meetings—Instructions to High Sheriff, *Oct. 23*, 623.
  Prisons, Closing of—Re-opening in view of number of Convictions under the Crimes Act, *Oct. 27*, 814.
  Sullivan, Sergeant, Charges of Perjury against—Retention in Force.
    Nolan's, Mr. J. P., evidence as hand-writing expert, *Oct. 27*, 813.
Irish Nationalist Members, Imprisonment of, *Oct. 20*, 235.
Nolan, Mr. T. P. — Attendance as Handwriting Expert at Trials—Permission given to Mr. Nolan to absent himself from Duties in Local Government Board Office—Deductions from Salary, etc., *Oct. 27*, 813.
Police Constable Rolls, Conviction for Perjury—Sentence, Witnesses for Prosecution — Opportunity for Resignation prior to Dismissal from the Force, etc., *Oct. 23*, 611; *Oct. 28*, 942.
Questions—Clerks at the Table ruling that they cannot allow a Question bearing upon a Question that has already been answered, alleged, *Oct. 20*, 240.

Madras
Railway, Management of—Contracts for Material and Freight given to German Firms, alleged.
  Q. Nov. 3, 1392.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace, Ireland
Resident Magistrates.
  Communications with Officials at Dublin Castle during last three months, Nature of.
    Q. Oct. 29, 1076.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace, Ireland—*cont.*
Resident Magistrates—*cont.*
  Hard Labour Sentences imposed under the Crimes Act.
    Government Instructions to Magistrates, alleged.
      Qs. Oct. 27, 818, 819.
    Harris, Mr., Sentence on, Judge Adams' Mitigation of Sentence imposed by Resident Magistrates—Furnishing Copy of Judgment to Resident Magistrates proposed.
      Q. Oct. 27, 816.
  Harrell, Mr.—Number of Attendances at Crimes Act Courts.
    Q. Oct. 27, 822.
  Position of, Absolute Dependence on the Executive, alleged.
    Os. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 27*, 905, 909; Mr. Wyndham, 926; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 931.

Maher, Mr. T.
Trial for riotous behaviour—Sentence of hard labour, alleged.
  Q. Oct. 22, 475.

Malay States
Report for 1901, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 7, 18.

Malcolm, Mr. Ian [Suffolk, Stowmarket]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 3*, 1438.

Mansfield, Mr. H. [Lincoln, Spalding]
Spalding Grammar School—Recognition of as Secondary School, *Nov. 3*, 1390.

Marconi's Wireless Telegraphy
Scotland, Use of Marconi System to Maintain Communication with England proposed.
  Q. Oct. 27, 810.

Margate Pier and Harbour Company
Report and Statement of Accounts Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1378.

Marine Insurance Bill
Bill Withdrawn, *Oct. 16*, 136.
Re-introduction of, proposed.
  Q. Oct. 27, 828.

Marine Works (Ireland) Act
Applications for Assistance under the Act—Consideration of Claims of Kenmare Port.
  Q. Oct. 21, 354.
Dingle Harbour, Application for Grant under Provisions of Bill—Consideration of Application.
  Q. Oct. 23, 620.
Liscannor Harbour, Provisions respecting, Date of Carrying out.
  Q. Oct. 20, 209.

Martello Tower
Brighton Vale, Sale of Tower—Amount realised.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1404.

Martial Law in South Africa
Commission of Inquiry—Report, Date of Presentation to the House.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 359.

Martin, Mr. R. B. [Worcester, Droitwich]
Flags on Private and Public Buildings—Issue of Warrant regulating use of Flags, proposed, *Oct. 22*, 466.

Martinique
Volcanic Eruptions, Correspondence relating to, with Map and Appendix, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 17.

Mather, Sir W. [Lancashire, Rossendale]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 161; *Oct. 22*, 411, 497; *Oct. 27*, 845; *Oct. 28*, 1045, 1053; *Nov. 3*, 1452.

Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, *Oct 16*, 135.

Mayo, North
Piers and Harbours—Claims of North Mayo to Grants from New Fund.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 600.

Meany, P.
Supervision by the Royal Irish Constabulary.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 815.

Meat
United States Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Medals
Coronation Medals.
Date of 26 June on Medals—Non-alteration of, on postponement of the Coronation.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 807.
Municipalities, Medals issued to heads of, Number and Cost of.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1395.
Troops sent home from South Africa for the Coronation—Regulars not taking part owing to Postponement receiving the Medal, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 468.

Mediterranean
Status quo, Maintenance of—H.M. Government's Policy applying equally to the Adriatic—Agreement between France and Italy, alleged.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 608.

Members of Parliament
Curtailment of Private Members' Rights under New Procedure Rules, Appropriation of Autumn Sittings for Government Business.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Oct. 16*, 33; Mr. G. Bowles, 35; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 51.

Members of Parliament—*cont.*
Imprisonment of.
Communication to the Speaker, Infraction of Custom, alleged—Vindicating Rights of the House.
O. Mr. J. Morley, *Oct. 16*, 65.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 220.
Irish Nationalist (Parliamentary) Party, *see* that title.
Suspension of Mr. John O'Donnell, *Oct. 16*, 80, 81.

Mercantile Marine
Ireland—Statistics Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 20.
Pilotage, By-Laws—Orders in Council Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347; *Nov. 3*, 1377.
Seamen, Number, Ages, Ratings and Nationalities of Seamen employed on 31st March, 1901—Return Presented *Nov. 3*, 1380.

Merchandise Marks (Prosecutions) (Ireland) Bill
c. 2R.*, Bill withdrawn, *Oct. 20*, 344.

Merriman, Mr.
Fraudulent Attempts by British Officers at Graaff Reinet to obtain during the War Evidence of Malpractices against Mr. Merriman.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 467.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board
Accounts for year ending July 1902 Presented, *Oct. 16*, 10, 25.

Metal Industries
France—Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Metropolitan Police
Report for the year 1901, Presented, *Oct. 31*, 1306; *Nov. 3*, 1376.
Rolls, Police Constable, Case of, *see* Rolls.

Michan, Paul
Fraudulent Attempts by British Officers at Graaff Reinet to obtain from Michan during the War Evidence of Malpractices against Members of the Cape Parliament.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 467.

Middlemore, Mr. J. T. [Birmingham, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 21*, 385; *Oct. 27*, 843, 844; *Nov. 3*, 1446.

Midland Great Western Railway Company, Ireland
Freight Rates for Coal, Reduction of—Revision of Canal Tolls, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1387.

Military Hospital
Shorncliffe, Establishment of Military Isolation Hospital close to Hythe and Sandgate Road proposed—Expediency of selecting another Site.
Q. *Oct. 31*, 1306.

Military Prisons
  Report on Discipline and Management Presented, *Oct 16*, 5, 19.
  Soldiers undergoing Imprisonment, Reconsideration of Sentences.
    Q. Oct. 20, 214.

Military Rides
  Brussels to Ostend Ride, Participation of British Officer — Preventing Officers competing in future.
    Q. Oct. 20, 213.

Militia
  Officers granted Commissions in the Army for Services in the Field—Placing on equal footing with those gazetted from Sandhurst.
    Q. Nov. 3, 1391.
  Officers serving in South Africa—Oufit allowances.
    Q. *Oct. 30*, 1189.
  Strength of
    Q. Oct. 30, 1189.

Militia and Yeomanry Bill
  c. 1R.* *Oct. 23*, 639.

Minerals
  Exports and Imports, Value of—Report and Statistics for 1901, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 18; *Nov. 3*, 1374.

Miners
  Abertysswg Colliery Explosion, Gallantry of Miners—Recognition of by award of Albert Medal proposed.
    Q. Nov. 3, 1396.
  Phthisis among Cornish Miners, Number of Cases, Number of Deaths since 1895.
    Q. Oct. 29, 1066.

Mines
  Lead and Zinc Mines—Exemption of Young Persons from Night Work, Order Presented, *Oct. 16*, 10, 24.
  Output and Value of Minerals—General Report and Statistics Presented, *Oct. 16*, 18; *Nov. 3*, 1374.
  Transvaal and Orange River Colony *see* those titles.

Milvain, Mr. T.
  Legal Assessor of the Remount Inquiry, Scale of Remuneration.
    Q. Oct. 29, 1067.

Mitcham, Surrey
  Pain & Sons, Messrs., Factory Explosion at—Report of Inspection Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 19.

Mohill Rural District
  Unexpended Balance of the Council appropriated by the County—Inquiry.
    Q. Nov. 3, 1401.

Monasterevan (Ireland) Railway Accident
  Cause of—Company's delay in reporting to the Board of Trade.
    Q. Oct. 20, 230.

"Montagu," H.M.S.
  Trial Trip—Unsatisfactory Results, Condition of Belleville Water-tube Boilers
    Q. Oct. 27, 806.

Montagu, Mr. J. Scott [Hants, New Forest.
  Inflammable Liquids, Carriage of on Railways, *Nov. 3*, 1384.
  Petroleum, Carriage of, on Railways—New Regulation making Consignors or Consignees responsible, Board of Trade Intervention proposed, *Oct. 22*, 463.

Montgomery, County of
  Charities, Inquiry into—Return Presented, *Oct. 27*, 793.

Moon, Mr. E. R. P. [St. Pancras, N.]
  Afghanistan and Russia, Relations between —Terms of understanding as to Sphere of Influence, *Oct. 29*, 1061.
  Lagos Lifeboat—Condemnation on arrival from England, alleged, *Oct. 20*, 219.
  Sekondi Pier.
    Draught of Vessels able to use Pier — Name of Engineer advising Situation, etc., *Oct. 27*, 803.
    Expense of Construction, Date of Completion, etc., *Oct. 20*, 219.
  Sierra Leone Government Steam Launch. Date of Purchase, Cost, etc., *Oct. 20*, 218.
    Sale of for less than half its Cost alleged, *Oct. 27*, 803.
  Somaliland—British Military Operations, Hospital Arrangements at Aden, *Oct. 27*, 799.

Moore, Mr. W.—*Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Chief Secretary* [Antrim, N.]
  Ireland.
    Ballymoney Post Office—Negotiations for acquiring New Site, alleged, *Oct. 23*, 596.
    Presbyterian Church—Position of the Moderator of the General Assembly, *Oct. 23*, 629.
      Privilege—Mr. Moore's Question on the Paper addressed to the Home Secretary, *Oct. 23*, 590.

Moray, Firth
  Trawling — Closing Firth to Foreign Trawlers.
    Christiania Fishery Conference, 1901—Resolution as to Closing Firth.
      Q. Oct. 30, 1192.
    Copenhagen International Fishing Conference, Discussion at
      Q. Oct. 23, 613.

More, Mr. R. J. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
  Cereals, Registration Duty on Imported Cereals—Calculation by the Quarter or the Hundredweight, *Oct. 22*, 472.
  Corn Returns—Separate Return proposed, Distinguishing between Malting and Grinding Barley, etc., *Oct. 22*, 472.

Morgan, Mr. Lloyd [Carmarthen, W.]

Carmarthenshire—Date of Withdrawing Muzzling Order, *Oct. 27*, 798.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 27*, 850, 884, 890; *Oct. 29*, 1103, 1109.

Morley, Mr. C. [Brecknock]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Oct. 29*, 1092.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J. [Montrose Burghs]

Ireland.

Coercion — Facilities for Discussion, *Oct. 16*, 27.

Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, Hard Labour Sentences — Number between July, 1887, and September, 1892, etc. *Oct. 20*, 238, 239; *Oct. 22*, 480.

Members of Parliament, Imprisonment of —Communication to the Speaker, Infraction of Custom, alleged—Vindicating Rights of the House, *Oct. 16*, 65; *Oct. 20*, 220.

Morrell, Mr. J. H. [Oxfordshire, Woodstock]

Oxford Parish Guardians — Additional Guardians for Parishes of St. Thomas, St. Ebbe, and St. Aldgate, proposed—Inquiry, *Oct. 17*, 141.

Morris, Judge O'Connor

Administration of the Crimes Act—Submitting Salaries of County Court Judges to the Criticism of the House, proposed.
Q. Oct. 27, 827.

Moss, Mr. S. [Denbighshire, E.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Oct. 22*, 537; *Oct. 23*, 658, 723.

Motions

Autumn Sittings, Appropriation of, for Government Business.

Adjournment of the House, Motion for — Power of the House to discuss Urgent Questions other than Government Business.
Observations on the Motion for Precedence of Government Business, Oct. 16, 30, 33, 73, 74, 77.

"Forty Days on the Table" Motions Discussion after Twelve O'clock, at night.
Q. Oct. 16, 26.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Oct. 16*, 32; Mr. G. Bowles, 37, Mr. A. J. Balfour, 48.

Motor Cars

Certificate of Efficiency, Requiring Driver to possess Certificate, proposed.
Q. Oct. 28, 939.

Excessive Speed, Report of Chief Constable of Surrey—Legislation.
Q. Oct. 20, 216.

Regulations as to Speed, etc.—Legislation.
Q. Oct. 27, 809.

Moulton, Mr. J. F. (Cornwall, Launceston]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com, Oct. 17*, 183, 192; *Oct. 20*, 288; *Oct. 23*, 712; *Oct. 27*, 890; *Nov. 3*, 1473, 1490, 1491, 1495.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 2R *Oct. 21*, 436.

Mount, Mr. W. A. [Berkshire, Newbury]

Army Canteens—Date of Publication of Report, *Oct. 30*, 1188.

Muldowney, Convict

Release of, proposed.
Q. Oct. 28, 950.

Mullingar

Quarter Sessions, Conduct of Judge Curran, in tearing up Resolution passed by Grand Jury requesting withdrawal of Proclamation of County.
Qs. Oct. 20, 240, 241.

Municipal Representation

Trading Companies, Limited—Practice in the Colonies, Laying Information on the Table of the House.
Q. Oct. 22, 466.

Municipal Service

Hard Labour Sentences, Disqualification from Service on public boards entailed by—Mr. P. J. Kelly's alleged statement.
Q. Oct. 29, 1063.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]

Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, 2R. *Oct. 22*, 553

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*Lord Advocate* [Buteshire]

Congested Districts Board—Expenditure on new Holdings since formation of the Board, *Nov. 3*, 1398.

Education—Continuation Classes in the Crofting Counties—Amount of Grant to be expended, *Oct. 28*, 949.

Fisheries.

Extension of the Three Mile Limit, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1399.

International Fishery Conference at Copenhagen, Publication of Report, etc., *Oct. 23*, 614.

Glasgow — Rectorial Election Disturbances —Precautions for the Protection of Life and Property, *Oct. 27*, 811.

Lewis, Isle of

Ness.

Death from Typhus—Interment Arrangements — Providing Isolation Hospital for District, *Oct. 22*, 474.

Harbour, Condition of — Date of issue of Report, *Nov. 3*, 1400.

Number of Crofters and Cottars in the Island at time of passing Crofters Act, *Oct. 29*, 1075.

[*cont.*

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*cont.*
Lewis, Isle of—*cont.*
Sanitary Condition — Appointment of Local Government Board Inspector proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1399.
Schools—Children providing Peat for Classroom fires, Disregard of Circular issued by Scottish Education Department abolishing Custom, *Oct. 21*, 354.
Small Holdings Scheme, Establishment of by the Congested Districts Board, proposed, *Oct. 23*, 613; *Oct. 29*, 1075.
Steamship Subsidy—Congested Districts Board granting Subsidy, proposed, *Oct. 28*, 950.
Shetland Crofters—Difficulty in obtaining House Sites, Giving Local Authorities Compulsory powers proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1398.

Museums and Colleges
Board of Education Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 20.

Muzzling Order
Carmarthenshire—Date of withdrawing Order.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 798.

Nanking
Trade Report Presented, *Nov, 3*, 1375.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [College Green]
Division interrupted by Motion for Suspension of Member — Position of Members with reference to the Interrupted Question, *Oct. 16*, 82.
Ireland.
Belfast, Public Meeting held on Custom House Steps—Railing in Steps proposed, *Oct. 21*, 356.
Coercion—Opportunity for Discussion of Irish Grievances, Injustice to Ireland, Proclamation of Dublin, etc., *Oct. 16*, 74.
Travelling Post Offices — Officers' Risk Allowances, Delay in Payment of Arrears, *Oct. 29*, 1060.

Natal
Scarlet Fever Epidemic, Cause of—Want of Precautions in isolating Battalion of Imperial Yeomanry, alleged, etc.—Inquiry proposed.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 464.

National Education, Ireland
see Education—Ireland.

National Schools
see Voluntary Schools. Refer also to References under Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Natu, Sirdar Balvant Ramchandra
Claims against the Government—Reply.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 462.

Naval Prize Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, *Oct. 16*, 136.

Navy
First Lord—Earl of Selborne.
Secretary—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
Civil Lord—Mr. E. G. Pretyman
Boilers.
Belleville Water-tube Boilers—Unsatisfactory Results of H.M.S. "Montagu's" Trial Trip.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 806.
Ships fitted with Scotch Boilers and Water-tube Boilers, Comparisons between—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 24.
Coal used by the China Squadron—Advantages of New Zealand Coal.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1066
Courts-Martial
Number held and Punishments inflicted in 1901—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 24; *Nov. 3*, 1374.
Cruisers—Construction of Cruisers of the "Drake" type to cope with Foreign Armoured Commerce Destroyers—Speed, etc.
Qs. *Oct. 30*, 1190.
Firing Salutes—Fatal accident at Portsmouth, Number of Accidents during the last ten years.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1383.
Fleets of the World Return—Alteration in Compilation.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 604.
"Montagu," H.M.S.—Trial Trip, Unsatisfactory Results — Condition of Belleville Water-tube Boilers.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 806.
Pensions to Widows of Seamen killed on Duty, Relieving Greenwich Hospital Funds, and devoting portion of the Patriotic Fund to this purpose.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 221.
Preserves Contracts—Names of Firms, Amount contracted for, Fair Wages Clause, etc.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1382.
Prison at Lewes, Condemnation of, as unfit for use, alleged,—Continued use.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 206.
Prize Money, Distribution of—Return Presented, *Oct. 29*, 1058; *Nov. 3*, 1376.
Reserve Drill—Facilities for men to perform their Annual Drill Abroad.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1190.
Sailors—Discharged Sailors, Employment of, in Government Departments—Carrying out Recommendations of Select Committee.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1185.
Scouts—Designs and Arrangements for Building—Speed, Armament, and Coal-carrying capacity, etc.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1383.
Shipbuilding, Delay in carrying out Programmes for 1901 and 1902—Commencement of Work.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 604.

Navy—*cont.*
Ships Commissioned at Chatham, Portsmouth and Devonport—Return Presented, *Oct. 30,* 1183.
"Terrible," H.M.S., *see* that title.
Training Ships—Return Presented, *Oct. 16* 24.

Netherlands
Financial Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 1, 17.
Trade Reports Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 3, 17.

New Caledonia
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

New Members Sworn
Chamberlain, Mr. J. Austen—For County of Worcester (Eastern Division), *Oct 16*, 15.
Forster, Mr. H. W.—For County of Kent (Western or Sevenoaks Division), *Oct. 16*, 15.
Lockie, Mr. J.—For Borough of Devonport, *Oct. 27*, 830.
Sloane, Mr. T. H.—For Borough of Belfast (South Belfast Division), *Oct. 16*, 15.
Walrond, Sir W. H.—For County of Devon (North Eastern or Tiverton Division), *Oct. 16*, 15.

New Writs for Parliamentary Elections
Devonport, Borough of, *Oct. 16*, 12.
Liverpool (East Toxteth Division), *Oct. 28*, 937.
Orkney and Shetland, County of, *Oct. 16*, 12.
York, County of (North Riding), *Oct. 23*, 590.

New Zealand
Coal—Use of by the China Squadron.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1066.
Fiji—Federation with New Zealand, Fijiian Petition to King Edward desiring Federation, alleged.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 216.

Newry
Constabulary, Royal Irish—Number and Religious Denominations of Force stationed in Newry.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 599.
Orange Demonstrations—Orangemen Discharging Firearms from Train—Failure to bring Offenders to Justice.
O. Mr. MacVeagh, *Oct. 22*, 580.

Nigeria
Intoxicating Liquors, Importation into Nigeria—Imposition of Prohibition Rates proposed.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1389.

Nolan, Col. J. P. [Galway, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 31*, 1336.

Nolan, Mr. J. P.
Clerk in Local Government Board Department, Ireland—Attendance as Handwriting Expert at Trials—Regulations as to devotion of entire time to duties of Office.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 211.
Permission given to Mr. Nolan to absent himself—Deductions from Salary—Remuneration for Employment as Handwriting Expert, etc.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 813.
Sullivan, Sergeant, Case of—Mr. Nolan's Evidence as Handwriting Expert.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 243 ; *Oct. 27*, 813.
Debate on Motion for Adjournment, *Oct. 20*, 308, 315, 317, 327, 332.

Norfolk, County of
Census—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 21.

Norman, Mr. H. [Wolverhampton, S.]
Brussels to Ostend Military Ride—Participation of British Officer, Sanction for, *Oct. 20*, 213.
Madras Railway, Management of—Contracts for Material and Freight given to German Firms, *Nov. 3*, 1392 ; *Oct. 26*, 724.
Remounts—Hungarian Purchases, Advice given to Gen. Truman, Lord Roberts, etc., by Hungarian Gentleman—Reason for ignoring Advice, *Oct. 20*, 214.

North Sea Fisheries
Convention—Three Mile Limit, Extension of—Feeling among Scottish Fishermen.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1399.
International Investigation, Cost of, Great Britain's Share—Amounts to be expended by other countries.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 610.

North-West London Railway Bill
c. *con.**, *Oct. 16*, 111.
3R*, *Oct. 20*, 202.
l. Commons' Amendts., *con.**, *Nov. 3*, 1373.

Northumberland, County of
Census—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 21.
Polling Districts—Order altering certain Polling Districts Presented, *Oct. 16*, 10, 24.

Norton, Capt. C. W. [Newington, W.]
Cruisers of the "Drake" type, Construction of, *Oct. 30*, 1190, 1191.
Railway Servants' Hours of Labour, Reduction of, proposed, *Oct. 29*, 1074.
Telegraph Learners—Competitive Examinations for Post in London, Number of Candidates and Vacancies at the last Open Competition, *Oct. 27*, 796, 810.
Woolwich Arsenal—Paymaster acting as Assessor and Collector of Income-Tax, Altering Procedure, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 805.

Nottingham, County of
- Census—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 21.

Nussey, Mr. T. W. [Pontefract]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 30*, 1209.

O'Brien, Mr. K. [Tipperary, Mid]
- Ireland.
  - Labourers.
    - Allotments for—Tipperary Improvement Scheme, Rejection of Application, *Oct. 23*, 618.
    - Housing of, Legislation, Government intentions during present Session, *Oct. 23*, 617.
  - O'Dwyer, Mr. M.—Sentence of Hard Labour under Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, Disqualification as a County Councillor entailed by Sentence, *Oct. 23*, 624.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 22*, 561.
- Ireland.
  - Belfast Custom House Steps, Public Meetings held on—Prohibition of Collection of Money, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 813.
  - Coercion—Special Facilities for Discussion, *Oct. 16*, 26, 27, 28; *Oct. 20*, 246, 247, 248; *Oct. 22*, 484, 485.
  - Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887 — Hard Labour Sentences—Instructions given by Mr. Wyndham, alleged, *Oct. 22*, 481; *Oct. 27*, 819.
  - Executions.
    - Coroner's Powers to detain Executioners, in order that they should give Evidence at the Inquest, Rules, *Oct. 22*, 478.
    - Detention of Executioner to give Evidence at the Inquest—Authority detaining Executioner pending Coroner's Decision—New Rules, *Oct. 27*, 819, 820.
  - Sullivan, Sergeant, Charges of Perjury against
    - Promotion since Trial in 1898, *Oct. 27*, 821.
    - Rank of, Place where Sullivan is stationed, *Oct. 22*, 483.
- Irish Nationalist Members, Imprisonment under Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act.—Terms of Imprisonment, *Oct. 20*, 233.
- Local Government (Ireland) Act (Amendment) Bill—Facilities for Discussion, *Oct. 27*, 827.
- Lunatic Asylums Return—Continuation of, the Return of 1895, *Oct. 28*, 943.

O'Brien, Mr. W. [Cork]
- Ireland.
  - Anderson, Sergeant—Irish Government Refusal to Discharge, *Oct. 23*, 634.

O'Brien, Mr. W.—*cont.*
- Ireland—*cont.*
  - Coercion, Policy of, *Oct. 16*, 39, 40, 42.
    - Opportunity for Discussion, *Oct. 16*, 26, 28, 38, 40, 41; *Oct. 22*, 489; *Oct. 23*, 630, 633.
  - County Court Judges—Submitting Salaries to the Criticism of the House, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 827.
  - Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887—Proclamation of City of Dublin and Nine Irish Counties under the Act, Harsh and Partisan Administration of the Act, etc., *Oct. 27*, 830, 890.
  - Dublin Proclamation of, *Oct. 27*, 814.
  - Hard Labour Sentences under the Crimes Act.—Sentence on Mr. Harris—Judge Adams's Mitigation of Sentence imposed by Resident Magistrates, Furnishing Copy of Judgment to Resident Magistrates, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 816.
  - Judges and Jurors, Difference of opinion on Local Matter—Communication from Mr. Wyndham, proposed, *Oct. 20*, 241.
  - Mullingar Quarter Sessions, Grand Jury passing Resolution requesting withdrawal of Proclamation of County—Judge Curran tearing up Resolution, etc., alleged, *Oct. 20*, 240, 241.
- Irish Nationalist Members, Imprisonment under Crimes (Ireland) Act—Terms of imprisonment, *Oct. 20*, 233.
- Sullivan, Sergeant, Charges against.
  - Charge against the Government of procuring Sullivan's acquittal while knowing him to be guilty, etc., *Oct. 20*, 248, 307, 320, 321, 322, 325, 326.
  - Libel Action against Sullivan in Dublin—Prosecutor financed by Mr. O'Brien.
    - *Os.* Mr. Atkinson, *Oct. 20*, 325; Mr. O'Brien, 326.
  - Nolan's, Mr., Evidence as Handwriting Expert, Prosecution of Sullivan for Perjury, proposed, etc., *Oct. 20*, 243.
  - Trial of—Amount paid by Government in Defence of Sullivan, etc., *Oct. 23*, 621.
- United States and Ireland — President Roosevelt's Message of Sympathy to the United Irish League, *Oct. 22*, 490, 491.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 2R., *Oct. 21*, 438; *com. Oct. 22*, 554, 555, 559, 565, 572.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P.—*cont.*
  Ireland.
    Condition of—Opportunity for Discussion, Refusal of Request when made by Irish Representatives, *Oct. 16*, 53, 55, 56; *Oct. 22*, 487, 488.
    Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887—Harsh and Partisan Administration of the Act—Prison Treatment of Irish Members, etc., *Oct. 27*, 908.
    Sullivan, Sergeant.
      Accomplice of ex-Sergeant Sheridan, alleged—Case in which Sullivan gave False Evidence, *Oct. 20*, 237.
      Action of the Government, Jury-packing at Sullivan's Trial, etc., *Oct. 20*, 330, 333, 334, 335.
  Irish Nationalist Parliamentary Party, Section—Objections to the Term, The Irish were a Nation, *Oct. 22*, 487, 488.

Odessa
  Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

O'Donnell, Mr. J. [Mayo, S.]
  Suspension of—Persistence in addressing the House and Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Oct. 16*, 80, 81.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]
  Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Oct. 21*, 458.
  Ireland.
    Congested Districts Board—Expenditure, Return proposed, *Oct. 27*, 817.
    Coomenaum Slip—Estimates for Slip submitted by Surveyor of the Kerry County Council, Rejection by Congested Districts Board, *Oct. 27*, 818.

    Dingle.
      Harbour, Application for Grant under Marine Works Bill—Consideration of Application, *Oct. 23*, 620.
      Railway—Grant for carrying out Alterations recommended by Local Government Board Inspector, proposed, *Oct. 23*, 620.
    Fenit Pier—Reducing Charge on Loan for construction of Pier to Treasury rate of borrowing Money, *Oct. 23*, 620.
    Inch Strand Foreshore Rights, Interference with—Ascertaining High Water Mark, Inquiry, *Oct. 27*, 826, 827.
    Inishvickillane Island—Removal of Historic Relics by the Irish Lights Board, *Oct. 29*, 1065.
    Local Taxation Account — Distribution of Accumulated Balance, *Oct. 23*, 620.

O'Donnell, Mr. T.—*cont.*
  Ireland—*cont.*
    Rae Estate.
      Delay in Sale to Tenants, *Oct. 22*, 483.
      Receiver's Accounts, Furnishing Copy to Mr. Rae, proposed. *Oct. 29*, 1065.
    Railway and Harbour Guarantees Return — Date of Completion, *Oct. 23*, 601.

O'Dowd, Mr. J. [Sligo, S.]
  Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2.) Bill, 2R., *Oct. 22*, 551.
  Ireland.
    Cloonacool, Excise Prosecution against P. Henry, Dismissal of case by Magistrates—Refunding Costs of the Defence, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 825, 826.
    Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, County and District Councillors, Number Convicted during past 12 months. and Number sentenced to Hard Labour, *Oct. 23*, 619.
    Kilfree Postal Service, Improvement in, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 798.

O'Dwyer, Mr. M.
  Sentence of Imprisonment and Hard Labour under Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act—Disqualification of Mr. O'Dwyer as a County Councillor entailed by Sentence.
      Q. *Oct. 23*, 624.

O'Flanagan, Mr. J. P.
  Imprisonment under Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887.
    Insanity, Development of—Character of Punishment, Dietary, etc.
        Q. *Oct. 20*, 244.
      Inquiry proposed—Scope of Inquiry, etc.
        Qs. *Oct. 20*, 245; *Oct. 22*, 478, 479.
      Report by the Governor of Limerick Prison, *Oct. 20*, 244.

O'Kelly, Mr. Connor [Mayo, N.]
  Ireland.
    Ballina Post Office—Change of Site, *Oct. 23*, 595.
    Mayo, North—Claims to Grants from Piers and Harbours Fund, *Oct. 23*, 600.
    Sullivan, Sergeant, Charges against—Action of the Government, etc., *Oct. 20*, 319.

O'Kelly, Mr. J. [Roscommon, N.]
  Mediterranean, Maintenance of the *status quo* — H.M. Government's Policy applying equally to the Adriatic—Agreement between France and Italy, alleged, *Oct. 23*, 608.

Opium
Ceylon—Increase in Importation of Opium, Inquiry proposed.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 216.

Oporto
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Orange Demonstrations in Ireland
Rostrevor and Newry Disturbances.
Firearms carried by Orangemen, Partial Operation of the Peace Preservation Act, etc.
Qs. Mr. T. M. Healy, *Oct. 22*, 574, Mr. MacVeagh, 579.
Proclamation — Names of Persons who were consulted as to advisability of proclaiming Meeting.
Q. *Oct. 24*, 727.

Orange River Colony
Administrative Questions and Questions affecting jointly the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, *see* Transvaal.
Mines — Summary of Regulations and Laws, Publication of, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1068.
War, Contribution towards Cost of.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 217.

Order in Debate
New Procedure Rules—Arrangements for completion during present Session.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 221.

Orkney and Shetland, County of
New Writ—Parliamentary By-Election, *Oct. 16*, 12,

Osborne Estate Bill
c. 1R.* *Nov. 3*, 1407.

O'Shee, Mr. J. J. [Waterford, W.]
Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act 1887—Members of the House asked to give bail in addition to sentence of Hard Labour—Discrepancy between period 1887-1892 and Nov. 1901—Oct. 1902, *Oct. 22*, 482.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *com.* *Oct. 22*, 557, 558, 560, 564.

Ostend
Military Ride from Brussels to Ostend, Participation of British Officer, Sanction for—Preventing Officers competing in future.
Qs. *Oct. 20*, 213.

Oxford
Parish Guardians—Additional Guardians for Parishes of St. Thomas, St. Ebbe, and St. Aldgate, proposed—Inquiry.
Q. *Oct 17*, 141.
Technical Instruction—Minutes sanctioning Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act Presented, *Oct. 23*, 592; *Nov. 3*, 1378.

Oxford and Cambridge Universities
Statutes Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347; *Nov. 3*, 1378.

Pacific Islands Labourers Act
Exemption of Islanders resident in Queensland from Terms of Act.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 466.
Papers relating to Presented, *Oct. 16*, 7, 18.

Palmer, Mr. G. W. [Reading.]
Post Office—Punishment of Learners for incorrectly addressing envelopes, *Oct. 27*, 797.

Paraguay
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Parcel Post
Transmission of Parcels to the United States, Arrangements with the American Express Company—Protection of the British Post Office from loss.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1385.

Paris
London and Paris Telephone Service, Period during which present Rate of Charge has been in force—Cost of Construction, etc., of French Section of Line.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 616.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend.]
Transvaal—Immigration of Settlers—Establishment of Department of Immigration, proposed, *Oct. 30*, 1189.

Parks
Bushey Park—Sale of Portion of Park to the United Tramways Company.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1186.
Treasury Contributions in lieu of Rates—Amounts withheld in England, Ireland, and Scotland respectively, in consequence of the Brockley Park Decision.
Qs. *Oct. 23*, 614, 615; *Oct. 31*, 1307.

Parliament
Autumn Sittings, *see* that title.
Bright's, Mr. J., Statue—Removing to better position in the outer Lobby of the House of Commons, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 615.
House of Commons.
New Members Sworn, *see* that title.
New Writs, *see* that title.
Sanitary Conditions, Improvements in.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1194.
Ventilation—Select Committee of Inquiry—Date of issue of Report.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1194.
House of Lords—Sat first.
Braybrooke, Lord, *Nov. 3*, 1373.
Cheylesmore, Lord, *Nov. 3*, 1373.
Members of Parliament, *see* that title.
Privilege, *see* that title.
Representation for Limited Trading Companies, Practice in the Colonies—Laying Information on the Table of the House.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 466.
Procedure, *see* title Parliamentary Procedure.

Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) Act, 1875

Exclusion from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed—Excessive Expenses entailed by Elections, etc.

Debate on Second Reading of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Oct. 22, 561, 563, 564, 565, 566.

Parliamentary Procedure

Irish Grievances, Opportunity for Discussion—Mr. Balfour's Statement that it was not in accordance with the Practice of the House to grant a day for a Vote of Censure except on demand of the Opposition, *Oct. 16,* 27, 28; *Oct. 20,* 246; *Oct. 22,* 484; *Oct. 23,* 631, 632, 633.

Observations on the Motion for Precedence of Government Business, Oct. 16, 53, 56, 74, 79.

New Rules.

Autumn Sittings Proviso, Drastic Nature of.
O. Sir C. Dilke, *Oct. 16,* 32; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 51.

Order in Debate—Completion of Rule during present Session, Arrangements for.
Q. *Oct. 20,* 221.

Postponement of further discussion until next Session, proposed.
O. Mr. Bryce, *Oct. 16,* 32.

Questions asked in the House on behalf of Absent Members—Personal Explanation by Mr. Tully, *Oct. 29,* 1079; *Oct. 30,* 1195.

Patent Law Amendment Bill

c. *con.,* 3R, *Oct. 21,* 441.

l. 1R,* *Nov. 3,* 1378.

Patent Law Amendment Bill

Anticipation of Inventions, Regulations as to.
Os. Mr. Caldwell, *Oct. 21,* 441; Mr. G. Balfour, 442.

Tribunal to deal with Petitions—Board of Trade, Giving Power to Board to Grant as well as Dismiss Patents, proposed—Expense incurred in referring Petitions to Judicial Committee of Privy Council, etc.

Debate on Consideration Stage, Oct. 21, 442, 444, 445, 446, 447.

Patriotic Fund

Pensions to Widows of Seamen killed on Duty, Devoting portion of the Fund to.
Q. *Oct. 20,* 221.

Report of Royal Commissioners, Presented, *Oct. 16,* 3, 19.

Paulton, Mr. J. M. [Durham, Bishop Auckland]

Westminster Abbey—Crucifix erected in Edward the Confessor's Chapel, Authority for, *Oct. 28,* 949.

Pawnbrokers

Ireland—Returns for 1901, Presented, *Oct. 16,* 9, 24.

Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1881

Objections to Continuance of Act.

Debate on Second Reading of Expiring Laws, Continuance Bill, Oct. 21, 426, 437; *Debate in Committee, Oct. 22,* 567.

Originator of the Act, Discussion as to, 570.

Partial and Unjust Operation of the Act, alleged, 571, 573, 574, 580.

Pledges of non-renewal given by Conservative Ministers from 1873 onwards, 428, 439.

Rifle Clubs in Ireland rendered impossible by the Act, alleged, 426, 432, 570, 574.

Peart *v.* Furness

Case under the Workman's Compensation Act — Medical Referee acting as Medical Witness.
Q. *Nov. 3,* 1395.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Oct. 28,* 1052.

Pease, Mr. J. A. [Essex, Saffron Walden]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Oct. 23,* 717; *Oct. 27,* 831, 835.

Pemba, Island of—Slave-owner retaining possession of Slaves by claiming them as Concubines, Right of Appeal under Article VI. of Decree of 1897—Case of Msichoke, *Oct. 21,* 350.

Pemba, Island of

Slavery—Concubines, Slave-owner retaining possession of slaves by claiming them as Concubines, Right of Appeal under Article VI. of Decree of 1897—Case of Msichoke.
Q. *Oct. 21,* 350.

Pemberton, Mr. J. S. G. [Sunderland]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 31,* 1356.

Penal Servitude

Hard Labour Sentences, Disqualification from Service on Public Boards entailed by—Mr. P. J. Kelly's alleged Statement.
Q. *Oct. 29,* 1063.

Penrhyn Quarry Dispute

Application by Parties interested for appointment of Board of Conciliation.
Q. *Oct. 29,* 1073.

Official Intervention suggested.
Q. *Oct. 21,* 351.

Pensions

Army Pensions—Return of Specially Granted Pensions Presented, *Oct. 16,* 5, 19.

[*cont.*

Pensions—*cont.*

South African War—Irregular Forces, Troopers killed in the War, Pensions to Relatives—Case of Mrs. Mackenzie.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1071.

Widows of Seamen killed on Duty—Relieving Greenwich Hospital Funds and devoting portion of the Patriotic Fund to this purpose.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 221.

Woolwich Arsenal Foremen's Pensions under new Pension Scheme.
Qs. *Oct. 28*, 945.

Peoples, Rev. Mr.

Belfast Sunday Disturbances on Custom House Steps—Mr. Peoples besieged by Mob, etc.
O. Mr. Devlin, *Oct. 23*, 689.

Perks, Mr. R. W. [Lincolnshire, Louth]

Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway (New Lines, etc.) Bill, *con.*, *Oct. 16*, 110; *com.*, *Oct. 28*, 1023; *Nov. 3*, 1452, 1454.

London United Electric Railways Bill, Motion to Re-commit Bill, *Oct. 27*, 791.

Piccadilly, City, and North-East London Railways Bill, *re-com.* *Oct. 29*, 1152, 1153.

Persia

English Trade with Persia—Agreements between Russia and Persia, and Turkey and Persia affecting Treatment of British and Indian Goods in respect of Customs Duties, Communications with the India Office—Laying Correspondence on the Table of the House, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 357.

Perry, Private

Services in South Africa—Injury sustained in the Field, Eligibility for Allowance.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 602.

Personal Property

Taxation of—Foreign and Colonial Systems, Date of issuing Return.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1390.

Peterhead

Harbour Works—Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 21.

Petroleum

Railway Carriage—New Regulations making Consignors or Consignees responsible.

Attitude of Managers, etc.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1384.

Board of Trade Intervention, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 463.

Pharmaceutical Society

Ireland—Officials, Apparent Exclusion of Roman Catholics—Modification of Constitution of Society, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 31*, 1311.

Philippine Islands.

Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Phthisis

Cornish Miners—Number of Cases among, Number of Deaths since 1895.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1066.

Transvaal Miners—Number of Cases, Number of Deaths, etc., since re-opening of the Mines.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1069.

Piccadilly, City and North-East London Railways Bill

c. Report,* *Oct. 23*, 590.

Motion to Re-commit to Committee, *Oct. 29*, 1141.

Piers and Harbours

Ireland.

Dingle Harbour, Application for Grant under Marine Works (Ireland) Act—Consideration of Application.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 620.

Fenit Pier—Reducing Charge on Loan for Construction of Pier to Treasury rate of borrowing Money, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 620.

Guarantees—Date of Completion of Return.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 601.

Kenmare Port, Claims for assistance under the Marine Works (Ireland) Act—Consideration of Claims.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 354.

Lehud Fishing Harbour, Improvement of—Congested Districts Board contributing towards Cost.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 599.

Liscannor Harbour—Date of carrying out Provisions of Marine Works (Ireland) Act.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 209.

Mayo, North—Claims to Grants from Piers and Harbours Fund.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 600.

Sums expended on, 1901-2—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 22.

Scotland—Proposed Fishing Harbour at Swordle—Refusal of Grant in Aid by Congested Districts Board.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1184.

Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. R. [Lanarkshire, Newton]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 23*, 712, *Oct. 28*, 1037.

Pilots and Pilotage

By-laws, Orders in Council Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Pirie, Mr. D. V. [Aberdeen, N.]

Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887—Hard Labour Sentences carrying Prohibition of Service on any Local Body for 5 years—Discontinuing infliction of on Local Representatives, proposed, *Oct. 22*, 477.

Pirie, Mr. D. V.—*cont.*

Military Courts in Cape Colony—Release of Prisoners sentenced under, proposed, *Oct. 29*, 1067.

Remount Department.

Accommodation for, Procuring Accommodation adjacent to the War Office—Delay in increasing Staff on the outbreak of the South African War, etc., *Oct. 23*, 606, 607.

Conduct of by Gen. Truman—Inquiry.

Costs—Sum paid to Gen. Truman for Counsel, etc., *Oct. 23*, 602.

Remuneration of Legal Assessor, Scale of, *Oct. 29*, 1067.

Report—Publication of Commander-in-Chief's Opinion, *Oct. 23*, 605.

South African War—Members of Cape Parliament, Fraudulent attempts by British Officers at Graaff Reinet to obtain evidence of Malpractices against Members, *Oct. 22*, 467.

Transvaal.

Grant of £3,000,000 for re-stocking Boer Farms, etc., Cost of bringing back Boer Prisoners—Charge on Fund, *Oct. 23*, 608; *Oct. 27*, 805.

Repatriation Fund, Use to which the Fund is put, *Oct. 27*, 805.

Yeomanry, Imperial—Cost of Outfit in Jan., 1900, compared with cost of Cavalry Outfit, *Oct. 23*, 602.

Plummer, Mr. W. R. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, Eligibility of Women, *Oct. 27*, 812.

Police

Licensing Act, 1902—Home Office Regulations for Guidance of Police Authorities.
Q. Oct. 23, 597.

Metropolitan Police—Report for the year 1901, Presented, *Oct. 31*, 1306; *Nov. 3*, 1376.

Perjury—Conviction of Police-constable Rolls.

Dismissal of another Policeman for Conduct in conveying Prosecutor to the Police Station.
Q. Oct. 28, 942.

Sentence—Witnesses for Prosecution, Opportunity for Resignation prior to Dismissal from the Force, etc.
Qs. Oct. 23, 611.

Shorthand Writer's report of Trial, Laying Copies on the Table of the House.
Q. Oct. 27, 811.

Police Expenses Bill

c. Bill Withdrawn, *Oct. 16*, 135.

Police (Superannuation) Bill

c. Bill Withdrawn, *Oct. 16*, 135.

Polling Districts

Order altering Certain Polling Districts, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 10, 24.

Poor Law Guardians

Oxford—Additional Guardian for Parishes of St. Thomas, St. Ebbe, and St. Aldgate, proposed—Inquiry.
Q. Oct. 17, 141.

Poor Law, Ireland

Auditors and Inspectors, Appointment of Members of the Poor Law Service, proposed.
Q. Nov. 3, 1403.

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act

Central Fund, Establishment of—proposed.
Q. Oct. 21, 348.

Poor Law Superannuation (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill

c. 1R.*, *Oct. 21*, 360.

Population

Census of England and Wales—Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 20.

Port of London

Report of Royal Commission, Board of Trade proposed Action, etc.
Q. Oct. 23, 599.

Portness Harbour

Report on condition of—Date of issue.
Q. Nov. 3, 1400.

Portsmouth

Firing Salutes—Fatal Accident to Seaman Cosham, Inquiry into—Number of Accidents during the last ten years.
Q. Nov. 3, 1383.

Portugal

Africa, South, Possessions in—Existence of Agreement between H.M. Government and Germany, Communication of Terms to Portugal.
Q. Oct. 22, 471.

Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 1, 2, 17.

Post Office

Postmaster General — Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

Canadian Postage Rates—Lowering Rates, proposed.
Q. Oct. 28, 948.

Employees.

Auxiliary Postmen in Eastern Central District—Holiday Pay on Coronation Day.
Q. Oct. 23, 595.

Bank Holidays, Payment in lieu of leave, Refusal of, alleged.
Q. Nov. 3, 1385.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*

Employees—*cont.*

Certificates of Character given to Soldiers who served in South Africa (Army Form **B**. 2077)—Post Office Authorities calling on Staff returning from the front to produce Certificates—Rule alleged, forbidding men to part Certificates.
Q. Oct. 22, 464.

Grievances.

Committee of Inquiry proposed.
Q. Oct. 21, 349.

London Sorters' Memorial to the Postmaster General — Delay in Reply.
Q. Oct. 31, 1309.

Mixed Duties—Sorters and Telegraphists working in both Branches of the Service, Decision of Departmental Committee.
Q. Oct. 28, 940.

Religious Tests, Rule respecting—*Belfast News Letter* Advertisement.
Q. Oct. 22, 473.

Ireland.

Ballina Post Office—Change of site.
Q. Oct. 23, 595.

Ballymoney — Negotiations for acquiring New Site for Post Office, alleged.
Q. Oct. 23, 596.

Belfast Postal Arrangements, Delay in the Delivery of Letters.
Q. Oct. 27, 797.

Clones—Delay in building new Post Office, Complaints of Staff as to hours of Work, etc.
Q. Oct. 29, 1060.

English Officials, Number transferred to Ireland during past twelve months.
Q. Oct. 21, 349.

Enniskillen—Early Morning Attendance Grievance, Reduction in number of female appointments, proposed.
Q. Nov. 3, 1386.

Kilfree Postal Service, Improvement in, proposed.
Q. Oct. 27, 798.

Limerick.

Postmastership, Appointment of Irish Roman Catholic proposed.
Q. Oct. 20, 230.

Punishment of Staff, Reconsideration of proposed—Custody of Safe.
Q. Oct. 27, 827.

Lurgan—Date of commencing new Building.
Q. Nov. 3, 1385.

Postmasterships — Appointment of Englishmen and Scotchmen, Discontinuing System.
Q. Oct. 30, 1187.

Post Office—*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Religious Tests for Employees, Rule respecting — *Belfast News Letter* Advertisement.
Q. Oct. 22, 473.

Travelling Post Offices—Officers' Risk Allowances, Delay in payment of arrears.
Q. Oct. 29, 1060.

Leek—Date of commencing Building of new Post Office.
Q. Oct. 27, 798.

Parcel Post to the United States, Arrangements with the American Express Company—Protection of the British Post Office from loss.
Q. Nov. 3, 1385.

Postmen — Number prosecuted and dismissed since Jan. 1st, 1901—Amount of weekly wages, etc.
Q. Oct. 29, 1059.

Reading Employees — Punishment of Learners for incorrectly addressing envelopes.
Q. Oct. 27, 797.

Savings Banks, Select Committee, Carrying out recommendations of—Reduction of Interest, Making date uniform in case of Trustee Banks and Post Office Banks, etc.—Legislation.
Qs. Oct. 20, 226, 227.

Stornoway Mail Service, Delays in—Enforcement of Penalty clause.
Q. Oct. 22, 474.

Postmaster-General
Mr. A. Chamberlain.

Postmen

Number Prosecuted and Dismissed since Jan. 1, 1901 — Amount of Weekly Wages, etc.
Q. Oct. 29, 1059.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 150, 153, 170; *Oct. 21*, 365, 381; *Oct. 23*, 661; *Oct. 28*, 988, 1024, 1026, 1032; *Oct. 30*, 1206, 1270; *Nov.* 3, 1475.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 22*, 559.

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 2R, *Oct 21*, 454.

Ireland

Coercion—Opportunity for discussion of Irish Grievances refused, *Oct. 16*, 77.

Court Houses, Use of, for Public Meetings—High Sheriffs' right to forbid Meetings, *Oct. 27*, 824.

Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament) Bill, 2R, *Oct. 21*, 452.

O'Flanagan, Mr., Imprisonment of—Development of Insanity—Inquiry, proposed—Admission of the Press, *Oct. 22*, 480.

Prayer Book
Alterations from the Authorised Text in recent Edition, Authority for.
Qs. *Oct. 27*, 808 ; *Oct. 28*, 942.

Prerogative of the Crown
Honours, Exercise of Prerogative on Advice of Ministers or otherwise.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 221.

Presbyterian Church, Ireland
Moderator of the General Assembly, Position of.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 629.
Moore's, Mr., Question on the Paper addressed to the Home Secretary —Question of Privilege.
Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Moore, *Oct. 23*, 589.

Preserves
Contracts for the Navy—Names of Firms, Amount contracted for, Fair Wages Clause, etc.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1382.

Pretyman, Capt. E. G. [Suffolk, Woodbridge.]
South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill, Lords Amendments, *Oct. 16*, 100, 101, 102, 103.

Price, Mr. G. R.
Registrar in the Chancery Division, Ireland—Pension, Treasury Minute Presented, *Oct. 30*, 1182 ; *Oct. 31*, 1306.

Prime Minister
Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.

Prisons
England and Wales—Report of Commissioners Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 18.
Ireland.
Buildings Closed.
Number Closed in Dec., 1901, by Order of the General Prisons
Q. *Oct. 20*, 210.
Re-opening in view of number of Convictions under Crimes Act.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 814.
Utilization of, Authority controlling, etc.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1064.
Typhoid in Limerick Prison—Report of Medical Inspectors Presented, *Oct. 24*, 726 ; *Nov. 3*, 1375.
Warders' Hours of Duty—Inquiry proposed.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 821.
Military Prisons.
Report on Discipline and Management Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 19.
Soldiers undergoing Imprisonment—Reconsideration of Sentences.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 214.

Prisons—*cont.*
Naval Prison at Lewes, Condemnation of, as unfit for use, alleged—Continued use.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 206.
Scotland—Inverness Prison, Order for Closing Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 25.
Soldiers in Local and Convict Prisons of the United Kingdom, Number of.
Qs. *Oct. 20*, 206 ; *Oct. 28*, 945.

Private Members' Time
Curtailment of, under New Procedure Rules—Appropriation of Autumn Sittings for Government Business.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Oct. 16*, 33 ; Mr. G. Bowles, 35 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 51.

Privilege
Breach of alleged—Imprisonment of Irish Members without Communication to the House—Speaker's Ruling that it was not a Breach of Privilege, *Oct. 16*, 13, 14.
Question on the Paper in the Name of the Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Chief Secretary for Ireland addressed to the Home Secretary—Objectionable departure from Parliamentary usage, alleged.
Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Moore, *Oct. 23*, 589.

Prize Money
Navy—Distribution of Prize Money, Return Presented, *Oct. 29*, 1058 ; *Nov. 3*, 1376.

Promissory Notes Act, 1863, and Promissory Notes (Ireland) Act, 1864
Exclusion from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, Sir A. Rollitt, Sir R. Finlay, *Oct. 22*, 559.

Property
Taxation of Personal Property—Foreign and Colonial Systems, Date of issuing Return.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1390.

Prosecutions Expenses Act, 1866.
Exclusion from Schedule of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed.
Os. Mr. Power, *Oct. 22*, 559 ; Sir R. Finlay, 560.

Public Buildings
Flags—Issue of warrant regulating use of Flags, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 466.

Public Records
see Records.

Pym, Mr. C. G. [Bedford.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 29*, 1098, 1167.

Quarries
Output and Value of Minerals—General Report and Statistics Presented, *Oct. 16*, 18 ; *Nov. 3*, 1374.

Queen Anne's Bounty Bill
C. Bill Withdrawn, *Oct. 16*, 136.

Queen's County, Ireland
Proclamation under Crimes Act—Freedom from Agrarian Crime, Statistics, —Withdrawal of Proclamation, proposed.
Qs. *Oct. 20*, 209 ; *Oct. 27*, 823.

Queensland
Pacific Islands Labourers Act, 1901—Papers Presented, *Oct. 16*, 7, 18.
Pacific Islanders Resident in—Exemption from Terms of Pacific Islands Labourers Act.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 466.

Questions
Members asking Questions on behalf of absent Members—Personal Explanation by Mr. Tully, *Oct. 29*, 1079 ; *Oct. 30*, 1195.
Privilege.
Question on the Paper in the name of the Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Chief Secretary of Ireland addressed to the Home Secretary—Objectionable departure from Parliamentary Usage, alleged.
Os. Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Moore, *Oct. 23*, 589.
Speaker's Rulings—*see* Speaker.

Quilimane
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 1, 17.

Rabinek, Mr.
Arrest of by Congolese Authorities.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 793.

Rae Estate, Ireland
Delay in Sale to Tenants.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 483.
Receivers' Accounts, Furnishing copy to Mr. Rae, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1065.

Railway Servants
Hours of Labour.
Reduction of, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1074.
Returns showing Number of Men working over Twelve hours a day, and Number resuming Duty after less than Nine hours' rest. Presented, *Oct. 16*, 7, 21.

Railways
Accidents—Board of Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 8, 21.
Continuous Brakes—Return Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1376, 1380.

Railways—*cont.*
Dingwall and Cromarty Railway—Progress of Scheme.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 610.
India, *see* that title.
Inflammable Liquids, Carriage of—New Regulations, Attitude of Managers, etc.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1384.
Board of Trade Intervention, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 463.
Ireland.
Dingle Railway, Grant for carrying out alterations recommended by Local Government Board Inspector, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 620.
Goods Rates—High rate of Charge from Newcastle West via Waterford to Liverpool, etc.—Facilitating Transit of Irish Produce to the English Market.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 817.
Great Southern and Western Railway, Accident at Monasterevan, Cause of—Company's delay in reporting to the Board of Trade.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 230.
Guarantees—Date of Completion of Return.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 601.
Kanturk and Newmarket Railway, Complaints as to Traffic Arrangements.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1077.
Midland Great Western Railway—Reduction of Freight Rates for Coal.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1387.
Statistics Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5, 20.
Transport of Troops — Selection of Route, Cost of Transport, etc.—Boycott of Southern Railroads, alleged, etc.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 629.
Petroleum, Carriage of (*see* sub-heading Inflammable Liquids).

Rankin, Sir J. [Herefordshire, Leominster.]
Education [England and Wales] Bill, *com. Oct. 28*, 1025, 1027, 1038.

Rasch, Maj. F. C. [Essex, Chelmsford.]
Army Reservists and Time-expired Men, Employment of on Fatigue and Special Duties, proposed, *Oct. 29*, 1072.
Re-enlistment, Terms of, *Oct. 29*, 1073.
Coronation Medal for Troops sent home from South Africa for the Coronation —Regulars not taking part owing to Postponement receiving the Medal, proposed, *Oct. 22*, 468.
Education [England and Wales] Bill, *com. Oct. 31*, 1345.
Teachers—Superannuation Provision under the School Teachers Superannuation Act—Inserting Clause in Bill, proposed, *Oct. 30*, 1185.
[*cont.*

Rasch, Maj. F. C.—*cont.*

Soldiers in Uniform, Admission to Theatres—Refusal of Admission to a Private, Preventing recurrence of Exclusion, *Oct. 20*, 212.

South African War — Militia Officers, Outfit Allowances, *Oct. 30*, 1189.

Rea, Mr. R. [Gloucester]

Education [England and Wales] Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 24*, 773.

Reading

Post Office—Punishment of Learners for incorrectly addressing Envelopes. *Q.* *Oct. 27*, 797.

Records

Local Records, Collection and Custody of—Report of Committee Presented, *Oct. 29*, 1057; *Oct. 30*, 1182.

Public Records—Documents of not sufficient Value to justify Preservation—Treasury Schedule Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 25.

Reddy, Mr. M. [King's County, Birr]

Arrest of—Communication to the Speaker. *Q.* *Oct. 27*, 824.

Imprisonment of, under provisions of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887 — Communication to the Speaker, *Oct. 16*, 12, 13.

National Expenditure, Select Committee on—Appointment of Member, Motion to substitute Mr. Reddy's Name for that of Mr. Hayes Fisher, proposed, *Oct. 20*, 249.

Redmond, Mr. William [Clare, E.]

Ireland.

Anderson, Sergeant, Case of—Mr. Redmond's Question with reference to the Speaker's Ruling, *Oct. 23*, 636, 637.

Coercion, Operation of—Imprisonment of Irish Members, Refusal of Opportunity for Discussion of Irish Grievances, *Oct. 16*, 66; *Oct. 23*, 632, 633.

Liscannor Harbour—Date of carrying out Provisions of Marine Works (Ireland) Bill, *Oct. 20*, 209.

Meany, Pat, Supervision of, *Oct. 27*, 815.

O'Flanagan's, Mr., Imprisonment under Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act—Development of Insanity, Character of Punishment, Dietary, etc., *Oct. 20*, 244.

Inquiry proposed—Scope of Inquiry, etc., *Oct. 22*, 479, 480.

Nationalist Members, Imprisonment of, under Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act—Treatment of, Hard Labour, Bread and Water Diet, etc., *Oct. 21*, 355.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools

Inspector's Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 7, 18.

Ireland—Inspector's Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 8, 23.

Remount Farms in South Africa

see Africa, South.

Remounts Department

see title Horses.

Reservists in the Army and Navy

see titles Army and Navy.

Revenue and Expenditure — Finance System, etc.

Committee of Inquiry into National Expenditure, Member appointed—Objection and proposed Motion to substitute another Name, *Oct. 20*, 249.

Richards, Mr. H. C. [Finsbury, E.]

Companies—Limited Trading Companies' position as to Parliamentary and Municipal Representation in the Colonies—Laying Information on the Table of the House, *Oct. 22*, 466.

"Drayton Grange" Transport, Inquiry into Over-crowding, etc.

Date of laying Report on the Table of the House, *Oct. 27*, 802.

Information from Colonial Authorities, Laying on the Table, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1387.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 22*, 538.

Remounts—Authority for Employment of Lord Lonsdale, Confining Purchases to Commissioned Officers, etc., *Oct. 22*, 465.

Strangford Lough—Wreck of the "William Bailey," Lighthouse being unprovided with Light or Beacon, etc., *Oct. 27*, 795.

Richmond Hill [Preservation of View] Bill

c. Lords' Amendts. *con.** *Oct. 16.* 109.

Ridley, Mr. S. F. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 29*, 1115.

Rifle Clubs

Ireland—Treatment of Ireland as compared with other parts of the United Kingdom—Effect of Peace Preservation Act, etc.

Debate on Second Reading of Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *Oct. 21*, 426, 432; *Oct. 22*, 570, 574.

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. T.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Croydon]

Corn Import Duty—Calculation by the Hundredweight, *Oct. 22*, 472.

Cloonacool, Excise Prosecution against P. Henry, Dismissal of Case by Magistrates—Refunding Costs of the Defence, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 826.

[*cont.*

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. T.—*cont.*
  Savings Bank Funds—Carrying out Recommendations of Select Committee, Date of Reduction of Interest, etc.—Legislation, *Oct. 20*, 227.
  South African War.
    Cost of the War, Total Expenditure, *Oct. 23*, 607, 608.
    Terminal Charges — Authority for Expenditure, *Nov. 3*, 1394.
  Transvaal Vote.
    Date of Taking, *Nov. 3*, 1406.
    Legislation not proposed during present session, *Oct. 22*, 472.

Roberts, Mr. B. [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 23*, 711; *Oct. 30*, 1268.

Roberts, Mr. H. [Denbighshire, W.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 21*, 371; *Oct. 23*, 719; *Oct. 29*, 1095, 1096, 1125; *Nov. 3*, 1415, 1469.
  Somaliland—British Military Operations, Troops, Composition and Number under Command of Col. Swayne, Reinforcements — Charging Cost to British Treasury, *Oct. 28*, 946.

Robertson, Mr. E. [Dundee]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 22*, 493, 508; *Oct. 24*, 737, 738, 759, 760, 761, 764, 767; *Oct. 27*, 883; *Oct. 28*, 956, 961, 976, 977, 1042; *Oct. 29*, 1085, 1086, 1097; *Oct. 30*, 1219, 1271, 1282.
  Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 2R. *Oct. 21*, 427, 434; *Oct. 22*, 553, 554, 559, 564.
  South-Eastern and London, Chatham and Dover Railways Bill, Lords Amendts, *Oct. 16*, 107, 108.
  Voluntary Schools
    Endowments—Return showing Capital and Income of each Endowment, proposed, *Oct 27*, 830.
    Trust Deeds—Laying Copies of Precedents of Trust Deeds on the Table of the House, *Oct. 21*, 348; *Oct. 30*, 1196, 1197.

Robertson, Mr. H. [Hackney]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 3*, 1441.

Robinson, Telegraph Clerk in Dublin.
  Suppression of Mr. O'Brien's Telegram concerning Libel Action against Sergeant Sullivan — Dismissal of Robinson, etc.
    O. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 20*, 316, 317.

Robson, Mr. W. S. [South Shields]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Nov. 3*, 1439, 1441.

Rollit, Sir A. [Islington, S.]
  Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 2R. *Oct. 21*, 428; *com. Oct. 22*, 553, 555, 557, 559, 560.
  Loans—Term of Repayment, Carrying out Report of Select Committee, *Oct. 27*, 808.
  Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament) Bill, *con. Oct. 21*, 450.
  London, Port of—Report of Royal Commission, Board of Trade proposed Action, *Oct. 23*, 599.
  Savings Bank.
    Deficiencies—Inquiry as to what the Government meant to do, *Oct. 16*, 42.
    Funds—Carrying out recommendations of Select Committee, Reduction of Interest, Making date uniform in case of Trustee and Post Office Banks, etc.—Legislation, *Oct. 20*, 226, 227.

Rolls, Police Constable
  Conviction for Perjury.
    Dismissal of another Policeman for conduct in conveying Prosecutor to the Police Station.
      Q. Oct. 28, 942.
    Sentence, Witnesses for Prosecution—Opportunity for resignation prior to Dismissal from the Force, etc.
      Q. Oct. 23, 611.
    Shorthand-writer's Report of Trial, Laying Copies on the Table of the House.
      Q. Oct. 27, 811

Roscrea Case
  Boycotting and Intimidation of Mr. Menton.
    O. Mr. Wyndham, *Oct. 27*, 923.

Rostrevor
  Orange Demonstration—Proclamation of Public Meeting, etc.
    Danger to Catholic Population, etc.
      O. Mr. T. M. Healy, *Oct. 22*, 574.
    Names of Persons who were consulted as to advisability of proclaiming Meeting.
      Q. Oct. 24, 727.

Roumania
  Jews, Treatment of—American Note, Publication of Correspondence — Opportunity for Discussion.
    Q. Oct. 20, 219.

Royal Prerogative
  Honours, Exercise of Prerogative on advice of Ministers or otherwise.
    Q. Oct. 20, 221.

Royal University of Ireland
  Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 7, 20.

Russia

Afghanistan and Russia, *see* Afghanistan

Dardanelles, Negotiations for opening to the Ingress and Egress of Russian Warships from the Black Sea, alleged.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 359

Persia and Russia, Agreement between, affecting treatment in respect of Customs Duties of British and Indian Goods imported into Persia, alleged.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 357.

Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 3, 17.

Sailors

see Seamen.

St. Helena

Boer Prisoners in, Repatriation of—Number still in St. Helena.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 804.

St. Vincent

Volcanic Eruptions, Correspondence relating to, with Map and Appendix, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 17.

Salmon Fisheries

Commission—Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 19.

Sassoon, Sir E. [Hythe]

Hong Kong—Cable Communication between Hong Kong and England.

Landing Rights, Granting for purpose of Laying Cables—Instructions to Hong Kong Government proposed, *Oct. 30*, 1193.

Reducing Rates, *Oct. 28*, 948.

Shorncliffe, Establishment of Isolation Hospital close to the Hythe to Sandgate Road, proposed—Expediency of selecting another site, *Oct. 31*, 1306.

Saunderson, Col. Rt. Hon. E. J. [Armagh, N.]

Devlin's, Mr., Attack on.
Os. Mr. Devlin, *Oct. 23*, 691; Mr. Sloan, 692.

Lurgan Post Office—Date of commencing new Building, *Nov. 3*, 1385.

Savings Bank Funds

Deficiencies—Inquiry as to Legislative Intentions of the Government.
Os. Sir A. Rollit, *Oct. 16*, 42; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 49.

Select Committee, Carrying out Recommendations of, Reduction of Interest, Making date uniform in Case of Trustee Banks and Post Office Banks, etc. —Legislation.
Qs. *Oct. 20*, 226, 227.

Schools

Lists of Schools under Administration of the Board of Education, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 20.

Schwann, Mr. C. E. [Manchester, N.]

Argentine Cattle, Importation of, into Great Britain for Slaughter, proposed —Negotiations with Argentine Government, Date of Admission, *Oct. 20*, 228, 229.

Civil Servants Superannuation Act—Committee of Inquiry, Constitution of Terms of Reference, etc., *Oct. 29*, 1058.

Colonial Cattle, Importation into Great Britain—Colonial Conference Negotiations, *Oct. 21*, 353.

Post Office Sorters and Telegraphists working in both Branches of the Service—Decision of Departmental Committee, *Oct. 28*, 940

Telegraph Service, Decrease in Candidates for Situations filled by Males—Altering System of recruiting the Service, *Oct. 28*, 940.

Scotland

Secretary—Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.

Under Secretary—Sir C. Scott Moncrieff.

Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray.

Solicitor General—Mr. C. Scott Dickson.

Aird (Stornoway) School Playground—Provision of Shelter for use in severe weather, proposed.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1381.

Avoch Channel, Scheme for lighting—Carrying into effect.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 794

Congested Districts Board, *see* that title.

Crofters and Cottars, *see* that title.

Cromarty—Railway between Cromarty and Dingwall—Progress of Scheme,
Q. *Oct. 23*, 610.

Dingwall.

Barracks, Erection of, during the ensuing year.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 941.

Railway between Dingwall and Cromarty—Progress of Scheme.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 610.

Education—Continuation Classes.

Crofting Counties, Number of Classes in—Amount of Grant to be expended.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 949.

Grants, Delay in payment of.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1184.

Fisheries, *see* that title.

Glasgow—Rectorial Election Disturbances —Precautions for the Protection of Life and Property.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 811.

Inverness Prison, Closing—Order Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 25.

Lewis, Island of, *see* that title.

[*cont.*

Scotland—*cont.*
- Liquor Traffic Reform—Legislation during present Session—Government Intentions.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 28*, 938.
- Local Taxation Account—Annual Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 20.
- Moray Firth—Trawling—Closing Firth to Foreign Trawlers.
  - Christiania Fishery Conference, 1901—Resolution as to Closing Firth.
    - *Q.* *Oct. 30*, 1192.
  - Copenhagen International Fishery Conference, Discussion at.
    - *Q.* *Oct. 23*, 613.
- Sheshader, Footpath for use of Children attending the Aird School, Date of Completion.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 27*, 796.
- Shetland Crofters—Difficulty in obtaining House Sites, Giving Local Authorities Compulsory Powers, proposed.
  - *Q.* *Nov. 3*, 1398.
- Swordle, Proposed Fishing Harbour—Refusal of Assistance by Congested Districts Board.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 30*, 1184.
- Stornoway, *see* that title.
- Telegraphic Communication with England, *see* Telegraph Service.

Sea Fisheries
- Ireland—Harbours, Piers and Boat-slips, Sums expended on—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 22.

Seaforth Highlanders
- Second Battalion, Date of return from South Africa—Quartering Battalion in Scotland, proposed.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 24*, 728.

Seamen
- Merchant Service.
  - Number, Ages, Ratings and Nationalities of Seamen employed on March 31, 1901, in the Mercantile Marine—Return Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1380.
- Navy—Discharged Sailors, Employment in Government Departments—Carrying out Recommendations of Select Committee.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 30*, 1185.

Secondary and Technical Education
- Minutes sanctioning subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of Technical Instruction Act—Presented, *Oct. 23*, 592; *Nov. 3*, 1378.

Seely, Major J. E. B. [Isle of Wight]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 20*, 253, 255, 271; *Oct. 24*, 737.

Sekondi Pier
- Draught of Vessels able to use Pier—Name of Engineer advising Situation of Pier, etc.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 27*, 803.
- Expense of Constructing—Date of Completion, etc.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 20*, 219.

Sevenoaks
- Parliamentary By-Election—New Member sworn, *Oct. 16*, 15.

Seychelles
- Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Shackleton, Mr. W. J. [Lancashire, Clitheroe]
- Cotton-weaving Sheds, Standard of Ventilation—Legislation proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1381.

Sheehan, Mr. D. [Cork Co., Mid.]
- Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *Oct. 21*, 457.
- Ireland.
  - Cork Rural District Improvement Scheme, Delay in Sanction of, *Oct. 23*, 618, 619.
  - Cork Rural District Labourers' Cottages Scheme, Refusal to Sanction, *Oct. 27*, 821.
  - Macroom Union, W. Creedon's Application for Cottage, *Oct. 22*, 476.
- Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill—Facilities for discussion, *Oct. 29*, 1063.

Sheshader
- Footpath for use of Children attending the Aird School, Date of Completion.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 27*, 796.

Shetland
- Crofters—Difficulty in obtaining House Sites, Giving Local Authorities Compulsory Powers to obtain, proposed.
  - *Q.* *Nov. 3*, 1398.

Shipbuilding
- Naval Shipbuilding Programme for 1901 and 1902—Delay in Commencement of Work.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 23*, 604.

Shipping
- Atlantic Shipping Trust, *see* that title.
- Cunard Company, *see* that title.

Shorncliffe
- Military Isolation Hospital, Establishment of, Close to Hythe to Sandgate Road, proposed — Expediency of selecting another Site.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 31*, 1306.

Siam
- Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Sicily
- Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Sierra Leone
- Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.
- Railways—Material for Construction of, Allowing the Public to Tender for proposed.
  - *Q.* *Oct. 29*, 1070.

[*cont.*

Sierra Leone—*cont.*
  Steam Launch, Construction of, for the Government.
    Date of purchase, Cost, etc. *Q. Oct. 20*, 218.
    Sale of for less than half its Cost, alleged *Q. Oct. 27*, 803.

Sittings of the House
  Autumn Sittings, *see* that title.

Skibbereen
  Labourers' Cottages Scheme — Rural District Council Application for Loan. *Q. Oct. 29*, 1078.

Slavery
  Pemba, Island of—Concubines, Slave-owner retaining possession of slaves by claiming them as Concubines, Right of Appeal under Article VI. of Decree of 1897—Case of Msichoke. *Q. Oct. 21*, 350.

Sligo
  Prison, Number of Prisoners in, under the Crimes Act, on April 24, and Oct. 23, 1902. *Q. Oct. 30*, 1195.

Sloan, Mr. [Belfast, S.]
  Ireland.
    Belfast, Sunday Disturbances on Custom House Steps—Mr. Sloan's Reply to Mr. Devlin's Attack, *Oct. 23*, 692, 693, 694, 698.
    Constabulary, Royal Irish.
      Belfast, Number and Religious Denominations of Force, *Oct. 23*, 600.
      Newry, Number and Religious Denominations of Force, *Oct. 23*, 599.
    Dublin Custom House—Nuns begging for Alms on Pay-Days, Abolishing Practice, proposed, *Oct. 30*, 1194.
    Rostrevor Public Meeting, Proclamation of—Names of Persons who were consulted as to advisability of proclaiming Meeting, *Oct. 24*, 727.

Smith, Mr. W. F. D. [Strand, Westminster.]
  Yeomanry—Machine Guns, Number of Regiments supplied with, *Oct. 22*, 464.

Snowling, Private, 2nd Norfolks
  Death of—Discharge from Aldershot Hospital while suffering from Typhoid, alleged—Inquiry proposed. *Q. Oct. 21*, 351.

Soames, Mr. A. W. [Norfolk, S.]
  Civil Surgeons attached to the Royal Army Medical Corps during the South African Campaign — Honours and Emoluments for, *Oct. 29*, 1072.

Soares, Mr. E. J. [Devonshire, Barnstaple.]
  Army—Brushes, Distribution of Hair Brushes free to Cavalry but not to Infantry, alleged, *Oct. 27*, 802.
  Braunton Lighthouse, Connecting with the Telephone—Provision of Money, *Oct. 27*, 795.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 24*, 746 ; *Oct. 28*, 971 ; *Oct. 29*, 116.
    Denominational Schools leased to School Board—Termination of Agreement and use of Buildings as a Denominational School, *Oct. 27*, 828.

Society Islands
  Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 1, 17.

Somerset
  Census—Return Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1377, 1380.

Soldiers
  Discharged Soldiers, Employment for Committee, Appointment of, proposed. *Q. Oct. 30*, 1188.
    Carrying out recommendations of Select Committee. *Q. Oct. 30*, 1185.
    Fatigue and Special Duties in Barracks. *Q. Oct. 29*, 1072,
  Imprisonment for Military Offences— Reconsideration of Sentences. *Q. Oct. 20*, 214.
  Imprisonment of, in Civil Prisons.
    Number in Civil Prisons for Military Offences and number for Criminal Offences. *Q. Oct. 28*, 945.
    Number of Soldiers in Local and Convict Prisons of the United Kingdom. *Q. Oct. 20*, 206.
  Theatres, Admission of Soldiers in Uniform —Refusal of admission to a Private, Preventing recurrence of Exclusion. *Q. Oct. 20*, 212.

Solicitor- General
  Sir. E. Carson.

Solicitor-General for Scotland
  Mr. C. Scott Dickson.

Somaliland
  British Military Operations.
    Cost of
      British Treasury, Charging Cost to. *Qs. Oct. 27*, 793 ; *Oct 28*, 946.
      Indian Revenue, Charging portion of Cost upon. *Qs. Oct. 27*, 793, 807.
    Foreign Office Responsibility for conduct of Campaign. *Q. Oct. 20*, 223.
      Consultation with the War Office. *Q. Oct. 28*, 947.

[*cont.*

Somaliland—*cont.*
British Military Operations—*cont.*
Hospital Arrangements at Aden.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 799.
Progress of Events.
Qs. *Oct. 21*, 360; *Oct. 23*, 609; *Oct. 30*, 1190.
Reinforcements, Composition of, Vis. Cranborne's Statements, *Oct. 20*, 222; *Oct. 23*, 609; *Oct. 27*, 946.
Retirement of Colonel Swayne, Vis. Cranborne's Statement, *Oct. 20*, 222.
Troops—Composition and Number of Troops under the Command of Col. Swayne.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 946.

South African War
Cape Parliament, Members of—Fraudulent Attempts by British Officers at Graaff Reinet to obtain Evidence of Malpractices against Members.
Q. *Oct 22*, 467.
Civil Surgeons attached to the Royal Army Medical Corps—Honours and Emoluments.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1072.
Compensation for Losses—Boer Losses, Limit of time during which applications may be lodged.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1391.
Contracts—M'Connachie Brothers, Contract for Tinned Rations, Number of Tins rejected—Fair Wage Clause in Contract.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 941.
Cost and Finance of the War.
Terminal Charges.
Authority for Expenditure.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1394.
Estimate Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1380.
Total Expenditure.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 607.
Transvaal and Orange River Colonies' Contributions, Amount fixed.
Qs. *Oct. 20*, 217.
Ladysmith, Siege of — Gun-carriage of H.M.S. "Terrible."
Designer of.
Qs. *Oct. 20*, 224.
Placing in Museum, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 939.
Martial Law—Commission of Inquiry Report, Date of Presentation to the House.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 359.
Militia Officers—Outfit Allowances.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1189.
Pensions, Irregular Forces, Troopers killed in the War, Pensions to Relatives—Case of Mrs. Mackenzie.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1071.
Strength of Garrison of 1st Aug., 1899—Reinforcements and Casualties between 1st Aug., 1899, and 31st May, 1902—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 5.

South African War—*cont.*
Teeth—Defective Teeth, Number of Men invalided for Defective Teeth.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 941.
Transport Service, *see* titles "Drayton Grange" and Transport Service.

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill
c. Lords' Amendts. to Commons' Amendts. *con.*, *Oct. 16*, 99.

Southampton
Census—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 21.
Technical Instruction—Minutes sanctioning Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1378; *Oct. 23*, 592.

Spalding
Grammar School — Recognition of as Secondary School.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1390.

Speaker—Rt. Hon. W. C. Gully [Carlisle].
Adjournment of the House, Motions for under Standing Order 17—Matters which were not urgent within the meaning of the Standing Order.
Attention should have been called to the matter at once. The whole object of the Rule was not that something which happened a long time back and had been committed since, but that some comparatively recent matter which there had been no opportunity otherwise of raising, should be made the subject of debate as an urgent public matter, *Oct. 23*, 634, 635, 636.
Relations between United States and Great Britain not a definite matter of Urgent Public Importance, *Oct. 22*, 491.
Bills.
Re-committal Motions.
Instruction to Committee, Member desirous to deal with Recommittal Motion and Instruction at the same time—The Member was at liberty to move the Instruction but he would have to state reasons why he desired to Re-Commit the Bill, *Oct. 29*, 1143.
Motion out of Order, *Oct. 29*, 1142.
Objections being raised to the Motion, the matter would have to stand over, *Oct. 27*, 791.
Second Reading, Motion that the Order be Discharged — Motion that the Debate be adjourned could not be put, neither could the Motion that an Order be discharged be debated, *Oct. 20*, 341, 342, 343.

Speaker—Rt. Hon. W. C. Gully—*cont.*

- Challenging the Speaker's Ruling contrary to Order—Raising the same Question again and again on the same point of Order, *Oct. 23*, 635, 636, 637.
- Divisions—Interruption of Division, Motion for Suspension of Member.
  - If Disorder intervened it was in the power of the Chair to Interrupt the Division and order the doors to be opened, *Oct. 16*, 81, 82.
  - Position of Members with reference to the Interrupted Question—That was not a point of Order, *Oct. 16*, 82.
- Imprisonment of Members—Irish Members.
  - Farrell, Mr. J. P., Letter to the Speaker, *Oct. 27*, 789.
  - M'Hugh, Mr. P. A.,—Letter to the Speaker, *Oct. 30*, 1181.
  - Motion expressing dissatisfaction at the want of courtesy could no doubt be framed, *Oct. 16*, 15.
  - Non-communication to the Speaker.
    - Four cases were referred to, concerning two of which there had been no communication, because, although convicted, the Offenders were let out on bail during an appeal. In such a case there was no need to comply with the usual practice, the duty of the Magistrate only arose when a criminal had been committed to prison and was detained there without Bail, *Oct. 20*, 234, 235.
    - Privilege—It was not a breach of privilege, although the course referred to was the proper and courteous one to take, *Oct. 16*, 13, 14, 15.
    - Questions intended to elicit information on this point were already on the Paper—It would be well to defer raising the Question until they had been answered, *Oct. 20*, 201.
- Interruptions—Mr. Speaker's Appeal to the Nationalist Members—they had received a courteous hearing, and in the spirit of fair-play, should allow the reply to be heard, *Oct. 20*, 323; *Oct. 27*, 921.
- Irrelevant Observations, *Oct. 23*, 693, 698, 699; *Oct. 27*, 904.
  - Amendment proposing opportunity for discussion of certain grievances — Other grievances could not be included, *Oct. 16*, 79.
  - Discussing merits of Acts upon Motion that the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill be read the Second time—It could only be done by Amendment to omit the Act on Committee stage, *Oct. 21*, 427.

Speaker—Rt. Hon. W. C. Gully—*cont.*

- Irrelevant Observations—*cont.*
  - Motion for Precedence of Government Business—Discussion of Coercion in Ireland, *Oct. 16*, 40, 41, 55.
  - Select Committee, Appointment of Member—Discussing merits of a particular Name or Person, *Oct. 20*, 250.
- Law of the Table—The Rulings were given by the Speaker and not by the Clerks at the Table, *Oct. 20*, 240.
- Motions, Amendment to, would not be in Order unless it was relevant to the Motion, *Oct. 16*, 40.
- Personalities—Hissing, a Member making noise must desist, Such a proceeding was quite unheard of, *Oct 16*, 37.
- Privilege—Question on the Paper in the name of the Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Chief Secretary for Ireland addressed to the Home Secretary—Objections to on grounds of Question being addressed to wrong Minister and that the Question was really asked of a Minister to whom the Member was Parliamentary Private Secretary—It was unusual because it was not usually found to be necessary. The Member was perfectly within his rights in putting the Question, *Oct. 23*, 589.
- Questions.
  - Argumentative Questions could not be put, *Oct. 22*, 482.
  - Arguments—Members were not entitled to enter into Arguments as to fulfilment of Pledges, etc. *Oct. 23*, 618.
  - Asking for information — Question which did not ask for information and was not a subject-matter of a Question (President Roosevelt's Message to the United Irish League), *Oct. 22*, 490, 491.
  - Debating the Question, *Oct. 16*, 27.
  - Making a Speech on the Question, *Oct. 20*, 241.
  - Member asking Question on behalf of another Member—It was contrary to the practices and courtesies of the House for a Member to ask another Member's Questions without his request—Mr. Tully's bundle of Questions selected from absent Irish Members' Questions. *Oct. 29*, 1079; *Oct. 30*, 1195.
  - Ministers replying one for another—It was not an uncommon course for a Minister to ask another Minister to reply, and it was the usual courtesy of the House to await that Minister's answer, *Oct. 23*, 621.

[*cont.*

Speaker—Rt. Hon. W. C. Gully—*cont.*

Questions—*cont.*

Question bearing upon a Question which had already been answered—A Question might be put to elicit a particular fact without referring to an answer previously given, *Oct. 20*, 240.

Supplementary Questions which were out of Order—The Questions had been answered and notice should be given for additional information, *Oct. 20*, 235, 236, 239, 242, 243; *Oct. 22*, 480, 481, 482; *Oct. 23*, 611, 612, 620, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628; *Oct. 27*, 815, 820.

Addressing a different Minister from the one to whom the original Question was addressed, *Oct. 20*, 242.

Rightly or wrongly, the Speaker had to be the judge in these matters, and he had given his decision — Business could not be properly conducted if Members persisted in putting Supplementary Questions, *Oct. 20*, 239, 240.

Time Limit.

It was Five minutes to Three and Questions must stop except those relating to Business and matters of Urgent Public Importance, *Oct. 20*, 245.

Questions excluded by the Time Limit would be answered in the Votes on the following day, *Oct. 20*, 246.

Reflections upon the Chair, Difference in treatment of Irish and British Members, alleged—Suggestions of that kind were wholly unfounded, Members expressing their opinion must do so with due respect to the Chair, *Oct. 16*, 14.

Select Committee—Name of Member proposed for addition to a Select Committee, Motion to substitute another Name,—The Motion could not be made, but objection might be made to the Name proposed, *Oct. 20*, 249.

Speaking a second time on the same Motion, *Oct. 20*, 250.

Speeches—One Speech at a time, *Oct. 20*, 250.

Unparliamentary Language — "Coward," Had the Member spoken of another Member as a "Coward," the Speaker would have interrupted him. The Speaker understood the Member to be referring to the policy and tone of a Speech and not to the Member personally, *Oct. 20*, 321.

Spear, Mr. [Devonshire, Tavistock.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 23*, 678; *Oct. 24*, 744.

Spencer, Earl

Business proposed for the Autumn Sittings — Adjournment of Sittings of the Light Load Line Committee until next Session proposed, *Oct. 16*, 10, 11.

Spencer, Rt. Hon. C. R. [Northants, Mid]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 28*, 1025.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *com.* *Oct. 22*, 556.

Staigue Fort Ireland

Damage to Structure by Cattle, Prevention of—Calling Attention of Board of Works to Condition of Fort. *Q.* *Oct. 20*, 210.

Stanley, Lord—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* [Lancashire, West Houghton.]

Cavalry—Maximum and Minimum Standards of Height, *Oct. 29*, 1072.

Martello Tower at Brighton Vale, Sale of —Amount realised, *Nov. 3*, 1404.

Militia and Yeomanry Officers granted Commissions in the Army for Services in the field—Placing on equal footing with those gazetted from Sandhurst, *Nov. 3*, 1392.

Reservists and Time expired Men.

Employment of on Fatigue and Special duties proposed, *Oct. 29*, 1073.

Re-enlistment, Terms of, *Oct. 29*, 1073.

South African War.

Civil Surgeons attached to the Royal Army Medical Corps — Honours and Emoluments, *Oct. 29*, 1072.

Compensation for Losses—Boer Losses — Limit of time during which applications may be lodged, *Nov. 3*, 1391.

Irregular Forces, Troopers killed in the War, Pensions to Relatives — Case of Mrs. Mackenzie, *Oct. 29*, 1071.

Transvaal—Repatriation of Boers, Number repatriated, Number still in their respective places of Confinement, *Oct. 27*, 805.

Woolwich Arsenal.

Paymaster acting as Assessor and Collector of Income Tax, Altering Procedure proposed, *Oct. 27*, 805.

Stevenson, Mr. F. S. [Suffolk, Eye.]
- Snowling, Private, Death of—Discharge from Aldershot Hospital while suffering from Typhoid, alleged—Inquiry proposed, *Oct. 21*, 351.
- Turkey—Condition of European Turkey, Communications from the Powers to the Porte—Laying on the Table of the House Reports of H. M. Consular Officers in Macedonia, *Oct. 22*, 471.

Stewart, Sir M. [Kirkcudbright.]
- Scotland—Evening Continuation Classes—Delay in Payment of Grants, *Oct. 30*, 1184.

Stoney Estate, Ireland
- Foreshore Rights belonging to the Crown—Owner of Rostock Castle prosecuting Migratory Labourers for gathering Seaweed, Representation of the Crown at Castlebar Trial. *Q. Oct 20*, 207.

Stornoway
- Aird School Playground—Provision of Shelter for use in severe weather, proposed. *Q. Nov. 3*, 1381.
- Mail Service, Delays in—Enforcement of Penalty Clause. *Q. Oct. 22*, 474.

Strachey, Sir E. [Somerset, S.]
- Dairy Products, Adulteration of—Proposed International Conference, *Oct. 27*, 799.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 20*, 263; *Oct. 29*, 1094.
- Personal Property, Taxation of—Foreign and Colonial Systems, Date of Issue of Return, *Nov. 3*, 1390.

Straits Settlements
- Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.
- Malay States—Report for 1901 Presented, *Oct. 16*, 7, 18.

Strangford Lough
- Wreck of the "William Bailey"—Lighthouse being unprovided with Light or Beacon *Q, Oct. 27*, 795.

Suffolk
- Census—Return Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1377, 1380.
- Technical Instruction—Minutes sanctioning Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act Presented, *Oct. 23*, 592; *Nov. 3*, 1378.

Sugar Bounties Convention
- Sanction by Parliament.
  - Adequate Time for Discussion of Resolution. *Q. Oct. 27*, 829.

Sugar Bounties Convention—*cont.*
- Sanction by Parliament—*cont.*
  - Government intentions as to asking for Sanction during present Session. *Q. Oct. 20*, 220.
  - Legislation prior to Ratification in February, 1903. *Qs. Nov. 3*, 1404.

Sugar Duty
- Amount received during present financial year up till September 30. *Q. Oct. 20*, 206.

Suir Bridge
- Tolls, Loss occasioned to the City of Waterford—Legislation proposed. *Q. Nov. 3*, 1402.

Sullivan, Sergeant
- Charges against—Retaining Sergeant Sullivan in the Royal Irish Constabulary, etc.
  - Accomplice of Ex-Sergeant Sheridan, alleged. *Q. Oct. 20*, 236.
  - Case in which Sullivan gave false Evidence. *Q. Oct. 20*, 237.
  - M'Hale *v.* Sullivan.
    - Forged Incitement to Outrage, Charge of—Letter to James Kelly purporting to come from Mr. M'Hale — Mr. W. O'Brien's Motion for Adjournment, *Oct. 20*, 248, 307.
      - Antiquity of Charge, Number of Times Case had been debated already, etc., 331, 332.
      - Charge against the Government of procuring Sullivan's Acquittal while they knew him to be guilty, 308, 327, 330.
      - Expenses of Sullivan's Defence, Government bearing Expense, 317, 328.
        - Police Contributions, 314, 330.
      - Handwriting Experts, Evidence of, as to Sullivan's Guilt—Confirmatory Evidence elicited from Mr. Nolan during recent Prosecution under Coercion Act, 308, 312, 315, 327, 332, 336.
      - Libel Action brought against Sullivan in Dublin.
        - M'Hale, Mr., Prosecutor in Action, financed by Mr. W. O'Brien, 325, 326.

[*cont.*

Sullivan, Sergeant—*cont.*
Charges against—*cont.*
M'Hale *v.* Sullivan—*cont.*
Forged Incitement—*cont.*
Libel Action—*cont.*
Result of Action, 316, 322, 326, 329.
Suppression of Mr. O'Brien's Telegram, 316.
Police Patrol Book, Falsification of Entry bearing on Sullivan's Case, alleged—Evidence of Constable Curtain, etc., 313.
Trial of Sullivan at Sligo.
Instructions sent to Crown Solicitor, 323.
Jury-packing, Treatment of Witnesses for the Prosecution, etc., 314, 323, 334, 335.
United Irish League—Sullivan's Incitement to outrage, part of a plot to discredit the League, alleged, 308, 310.
Westmill District penalised to pay for extra Police on the strength of Sullivan's Representations, 311, 319.
Laying Shorthand-writer's Report of Civil Action on the Table of the House, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 825.
Nolan's, Mr., Evidence as Handwriting Expert—Prosecution of Sullivan for Perjury, proposed.
Qs. *Oct. 20*, 243 ; *27*, 813.
Place where Sullivan is stationed—Present Rank.
Q *Oct. 22*, 483.
Promotion since Trial in 1898.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 821.
Trial of—Costs, Amount paid by Government in Defence of Sullivan.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 621.

Superannuation
Civil Service, *see* that title.

Supply
Procedure.
Appropriations-in-aid—South African War, Terminal Charges, Authority for Expenditure.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1394.
Autumn Sittings, Introduction of new Estimates after the Committee of Supply was closed and the Appropriation Act passed—Unprecedented Proceeding and contrary to the Sessional Supply Order.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles, *Oct. 16*, 36 ; Sir W. Harcourt, 47.

Supply—*cont.*
Procedure—*cont.*
Transvaal Vote — Estimate for Terminal Expenses Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1380.

Supreme Court of Judicature
Account of Receipts and Payments for Year ended Feb. 28, 1901, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 22.

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill
c. 1R,* *Oct. 17*, 142.
2R, *Oct. 21*, 460.

Surrey, County of
Census—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 21.

Suspension of Members
O'Donnell, Mr. John, Suspension of, *Oct. 16*, 80, 81.

Sussex, County of
Census—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 21.

Sweden
Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 1, 17.

Swordle
Harbour, Construction of proposed—Refusal of Assistance by Congested Districts Board.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1184.

Swords Borough School
Keegan, M., Successful competitor for Scholarship disqualified by Examiners—Referring matter to National Board of Education.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1077.

Talbot, Lord Edmund [Sussex, Chichester]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com* *Oct. 31*, 1323.

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. [Oxford University].
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 29*, 1118.

Taxation
Ireland—Local Taxation Account—Distribution of Accumulated Balance.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 620.
Personal Property, Taxation of—Foreign and Colonial Systems, Date of issuing Return.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1390.

Teachers
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *see* that title.
Elementary School Teachers' Deferred Annuity Fund—Date of Circulation of Accounts.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1062.

Teeth
Army—Defective Teeth, Number of Men invalided from South Africa for Defective Teeth — Improving Dental Condition of the rank and file.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 941.

Telegraph Service
Employees.
Candidates for Male Situations, Decrease in—Altering System of recruiting the Service.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 940.
Competitions for Post of Telegraph Learner—Number of Candidates and Number of Vacancies at the last open Competition, etc.
Qs. *Oct. 27*, 796, 810.
Grievances—Committee of Inquiry, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 349.
Mixed Duties—Telegraphists working in both branches of the Service, Decision of Departmental Committee.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 940.
Royal Progress on 25th Oct.—Granting same Concessions to London Telegraphists as on Coronation Day.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 473.
Scotland—Interruption of Service between England and Scotland by frequent breakdown of Wires.
Marconi System, Establishment of proposed.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 810.
Underground System.
Extension of.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 617.
Furthest Point to which wires have been laid down.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 810.

Telephone Service
Berlin and London, Establishing Communication between.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 617.
Brussels and London, Establishment of Communication between.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 617.
Great Britain and France.
Convention between—Copy Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 17.
Period during which present Rate of Charge has been in force—Cost of Construction, etc., of French section of Line.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 616.

Terrible," H.M.S.
Date of leaving Hong-Kong, Number of days occupied in reaching Portsmouth, and Amount of Coal consumed, Capability of maintaining designed Speed.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 224.
Ladysmith Gun-Carriage.
Designer of.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 224.
Museum, Placing in, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 939.

Theatres
Soldiers in Uniforms, Admission of—Refusal of Admission to a Private, Preventing recurrence of Exclusion.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 212.

Thomas, Mr. Abel [Carmarthen, E.]
Education [England and Wales] Bill, *com.* *Oct. 17*, 157 ; *Oct. 28*, 993.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Coal for the Navy—Use of New Zealand Coal by the China Squadron, *Oct. 29*, 1066.
Penrhyn Quarry Dispute—Application by Parties interested for appointment of Board of Conciliation, *Oct. 29*, 1073.

Thompson, Dr. E. C. [Monaghan, N.]
Indian Army—Medical Corps, Increase in Pay, *Oct. 30*, 1184.
Ireland.
Clones Post Office—Delay in building new Post Office, Complaints of, Staff as to hours of work, etc. *Oct. 29*, 1060.
Enniskillen Post Office—Early morning Attendance Grievance, Reduction in number of female appointments, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1386.
Postmasterships — Appointment of Englishmen and Scotchmen, Discontinuing System, *Oct. 30*, 1187.

Thompsons at Templemore
Boycotting and Intimidation of.
O. Mr. Wyndham, *Oct. 27*, 920.

Time Expired Men
see Army.

"Times'
Wyndham's, Mr., Recognition of the United Irish League as the Official Organisation of Tenants in Ireland.
O. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 27*, 892.

Tipperary
Labourers, Allotments for—Tipperary Improvements Scheme, Rejection of Applications.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 618.

Tiverton
Parliamentary By-Election—New Member sworn, *Oct. 16*, 15.

Tomlinson, Sir W. E. M. [Preston]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 28*, 1026.

Toxteth
Parliamentary By-Election —New Writ, *Oct. 28*, 937.

Trade, Board of

President—Rt. Hon. G. W. Balfour.

Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. A. B. Law.

Conciliation in Trade Disputes, Powers of—Penrhyn Quarry Dispute.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1073.

Trade Reports

Annual Series Presented, *Oct. 16*, 1, 2, 17; *Oct. 20*, 204; *Oct. 24*, 726; *Nov. 3*, 1375.

Miscellaneous Series Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Trade and Commerce

Persia, British Trade with—Agreements between Russia and Persia, and Turkey and Persia affecting treatment in respect of Customs Duties of British and Indian Goods, Correspondence with Indian Government—Laying on the Table of the House, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 357.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony—Customs Arrangements, Preferential Treatment of British Goods, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 608.

Trading Companies, Limited

Parliamentary and Municipal Representation—Practice in the Colonies, Laying Information on the Table of the House.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 466.

Training Ships for the Navy

Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 24.

Transport Service to South Africa

"Drayton Grange" *see* that title.

Name, Tonnage and Speed of Vessels, and Port of Departure and Arrival, etc.—Return Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347.

Transvaal

Cattle and Live Stock, Imports of, Tax on.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1071.

Customs Arrangement with Transvaal and Orange River Colony—Preferential Treatment of British Goods, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 608.

Grant and Loan for re-stocking Boer Farms, etc., *see* subheading Repatriation.

Immigration of Settlers—Establishment of Department of Immigration, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1189.

Mines.

Disputes between Mine-Owners and Miners—Establishment of Board of Arbitration, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1068.

Transvaal—*cont.*

Mines—*cont.*

Phthisis, Prevalence of, among Miners—Inquiry, proposed.
Qs. *Oct. 21*, 352; *Oct. 29*, 1069.

Summary of Regulations and Laws, Publication of, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 29*, 1068.

Taxation of—Ten per cent. Tax on Profits—Intentions as to increase and application of, etc.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 217.

Repatriation—Grant and Loan for re-stocking Boer Farms, etc.

Grant of £3,000,000 for re-stocking Boer Farms, etc.

Amount spent.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 608.

Cost of bringing back Boer Prisoners—Charge on Fund.
Qs. *Oct. 23*, 608; *Oct. 27*, 805.

Legislation, Date of introducing Bill—Purposes to which Proceeds of Loan are to be applied.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 472.

Opportunity for Discussion.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *Oct. 16*, 43; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 48.

Number of Boer Prisoners repatriated, Number still in their respective Places of Confinement, etc.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 804.

Use to which the Fund is put.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 805.

Taxation of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, Government Proposals—Opportunity for Discussion.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 944.

War Expenditure—Amount of Transvaal Contribution.
Qs. *Oct. 20*, 217.

Trawling

Moray Firth, Closing to Foreign Trawlers. Christiania Fishery Conference, 1901—Resolution as to Closing Firth.
Q. *Oct. 30*, 1192.

Copenhagen International Fisheries Conference, Discussion at.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 613.

Three Mile Limit, Extension of—Representations to the Signatories of the North Sea Convention proposed.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1399.

Treasury

First Lord.—Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.

Financial Secretary. — Mr. W. H. Fisher.

Public Records—Documents of not sufficient Value to justify Preservation—Schedule Presented, *Oct. 16*, 9, 25.

Treaty Series
  Papers Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 7, 17, 25.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [York, W.R., Elland]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 17*, 151, 191; *Oct. 20*, 253, 285; *Oct. 22*, 537; *Oct. 23*, 653, 716, 720; *Oct. 28*, 983; *Oct. 29*, 1107; *Oct. 30*, 1198, 1286, 1290; *Oct. 31*, 1363; *Nov. 3*, 1414, 1421, 1422, 1496.

Trew, Mr.
  Belfast, Sunday Disturbances on Custom House Steps caused by Mr. Trew and his Supporters.
    Os. Mr. Devlin, *Oct. 23*, 698; Mr. Wyndham, 695.

Truman, General
  Remounts Department, Conduct of, *see* Horses.

Trustee Savings Banks
  Select Committee, Carrying out recommendations of—Reduction of Interest, Making date uniform in case of Trustee Banks and Post Office Banks, etc. —Legislation.
    Qs. *Oct. 20*, 226, 227.

Trusts
  Atlantic Shipping Trust, *see* that title.

Tullamore Gaol, Ireland
  Prisoners Sentenced under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act—Number sentenced to Hard Labour, Dietary, etc.
    Q. *Oct. 21*, 355.

Tully, Mr. J. [Leitrim, S.]
  Divisions—Mr. Tully complained that he had not been counted and it was his only chance of voting.
    Os. Mr. Tully, Mr. J. W. Lowther *Oct. 31*, 1361.

  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.* *Oct. 31*, 1343, 1361.

  European Turkey, Condition of, Communications from the Powers to the Porte —Laying on the Table of the House Reports of H.M. Consular Officers in Macedonia.
    Q. *Oct. 22*, 471.

  Ireland.

    Belfast — Unlawful Assemblies, Number of Prosecutions for, during past two years, *Nov. 3*, 1404.

    Boyle and Castlerea Unions, Number of extra Force stationed in—Cost, etc., *Oct. 28*, 950, 951.

    Brighton Vale, Sale of Martello Tower —Amount realised, *Nov. 3*, 1404.

    Cavan and Leitrim Assizes, White Glove Calendar—Withdrawal of Proclamation under the Crimes Act, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1403.

Tully, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Ireland—*cont.*
    Cork Exhibition—Visit of the Chief Secretary, Withdrawal of Proclamation proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1401.

    Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887, Harsh and Partisan Administration of—Land Question in Ireland, etc., *Oct. 27*, 911.

    Kanturk and Newmarket Railway—Complaints as to Traffic Arrangements, *Oct. 29*, 1077.

    Land purchased by the Congested Districts Board since Jan., 1900, etc., *Nov. 3*, 1401.

    Land Question—Recommendations of Westport Rural District Council, *Nov. 3*, 1402.

    Mohill Rural District Council appropriated by the County—Inquiry, *Nov. 3*, 1401.

    Poor Law Audits—Appointment of Inspectors and Auditors from the Poor Law Service, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1403.

    Prisoners under Crimes Act of 1887—Political Prisoners subjected to same treatment as ordinary Prisoners, alleged, *Oct. 29*, 1078.

    Prison Warders, Hours of Duty—Inquiry proposed, *Oct. 27*, 821.

    Resident Magistrates — Communications with Officials at Dublin Castle during last three months, Nature of, *Oct. 29*, 1076.

    Skibbereen Labourers' Cottages Scheme Rural District Council application for Loan, *Oct. 29*, 1078.

    Sligo Prison, Number of Prisoners in, under the Crimes Act on April 24 and Oct. 23, 1902, *Oct. 30*, 1195.

    Suir Bridge Tolls, Loss occasioned to the City of Waterford—Legislation proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1404.

  Local Government (Ireland) Bill.

    Date of taking, *Nov. 3*, 1407.

    Facilities for Discussion, *Nov. 3*, 1403, 1404.

  Muldowney, Convict, Release of, proposed, *Oct. 28*, 950.

  Questions asked in the House on behalf of Absent Members—Personal Explanation, *Oct. 29*, 1079; *Oct. 30*, 1195.

Turkey
  Condition of—Communications from the Powers to the Porte, Laying Reports of Consular Officers on the Table of the House.
    Q. *Oct. 22*, *471*

[*cont.*

Turkey—*cont.*
Dardanelles, Negotiations for altering Rules and Obligations as to the Dardanelles, alleged.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 359.

Persia and Turkey, Agreement between, affecting treatment in respect of Customs Duties of British and Indian Goods imported into Persia, Correspondence with Indian Government—Laying on the Table of the House, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 357.

Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Turks Island
Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Twelve O'Clock Rule
Autumn Sittings—Assurance that Members would not be required to sit after midnight.
O. Mr. Bryce, *Oct. 16*, 31.

Typhoid Fever
Limerick City and Prisons—Report of Medical Inspectors Presented, *Oct. 24*, 726; *Nov. 3*, 1375.

Typhus
Lewis, Island of—Death from Typhus in the Ness District.
Insanitary Condition of House in which Mackay died — Public Health Authorities neglecting to remove patient.
Q. *Oct. 27*, 796.
Interment Arrangements—Providing Isolation Hospital for District.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 474.

Uganda
Orders in Council Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Railway.
Balance Sheet, Laying on the Table of the House, proposed.
Q. *Oct. 28*, 609.
Progress of Works-Report of Mombasa-Victoria Railway Committee Presented, *Oct. 28*, 938; *Nov. 3*, 1375.

United Irish League
Boycotting and Intimidation, *see* that title.

Crime in Ireland—Work of the League in banishing Crime as a means of Agitation.
Os. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 20*, 310; *Oct. 27*, 896.

De Freyne Estate Rent Strike—Strike entered upon by Tenants without Consultation with the League.
O. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 27*, 899.

United Irish League—*cont.*
Roosevelt's, President, Message of Sympathy.
Motion for Adjournment (Mr. W. O'Brien), *Oct.* 22, 490, 491.

Sullivan's, Sergeant, Incitement to Outrage in Westmill, part of a Plot to discredit the League, alleged.
Os. Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 20*, 308, 310.

United States
Cattle and Meat Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Coal Industry of the Consular District of Chicago—Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Ireland and United States—President Roosevelt's Message of Sympathy to the United Irish League.
Motion for Adjournment (Mr. W. O'Brien), *Oct. 22*, 490, 491

Iron Ore Industry—Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 3, 17.

Parcel Post between Great Britain and United States, Arrangements with the American Express Company, Express Companies declining to facilitate, alleged.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1385.

Roumania, Treatment of Jews—Publication of Correspondence on American Note, Opportunity for discussing Question.
Q. *Oct. 20*, 219.

Trade Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Universities
Oxford and Cambridge — Statutes Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347; *Nov. 3*, 1378.

Royal University of Ireland — Annual Report Presented, *Oct. 16*, 7, 20.

Vaccination
Bethnal Green Prosecution — Sale of bicycle disdained for Non-payment of Fine.
Q. *Oct. 31*, 1310.

Exemption Certificate—Mr. J. F. Back's Application for Certificate under the Conscience Clause—Refusal of Application and subsequent imprisonment of Mr. Back for being without Certificate.
Q. *Oct. 21*, 353.

Vincent, Sir Howard [Sheffield, Central]
Alien Immigration—Royal Commission—Date of Presentation of Report, *Oct. 27*, 809.

Army—Defective Teeth, Number of Men invalided from South Africa for Defective Teeth—Improving Dental Condition of the Rank and File, *Oct. 28*, 941.

[*cont.*

Vincent, Sir Howard—*cont.*

Government Departments, Employment of Discharged Soldiers and Sailors — Carrying out Recommendations of Select Committee, *Oct. 30*, 1185.

Motor Cars, Excessive Speed—Legislation *Oct. 20*, 216.

Soldiers—Discharged Soldiers, Employment for—Appointment of Committee, proposed, *Oct. 30*, 1188.

Transvaal and Orange River Colony—Customs Arrangements—Preferential Treatment of British Goods, proposed, *Oct. 23*, 608.

Volunteers—Musketry Regulations, Consultation with Council of Commanding Officers' Association as to details of new Regulations, *Oct. 23*, 605.

Volunteers

Armament, Placing heavy batteries on a footing of efficiency — Horsing 15-pounder B.L. Guns as R.F.A. Guns, etc.
Q. Nov. 3, 1388.

Musketry Regulations—Consultation with Representative Volunteer Officers prior to issue of New Regulations.
Q. Oct. 23, 605.

Strength of—Statistics.
Q. Oct. 30, 1189.

Wages

Fair Wage Resolution—M'Connachie Brothers, Contract for supplying Tinned Rations to the Troops in South Africa—Fair Wage Clause in Contract.
Q. Oct. 28, 941.

Waima Incident

Arbitration—Date of Payment of Compensation by French Government, Distribution of Money.
Q. Oct. 27, 794.

Wales

Abertysswg Colliery Explosion, Gallantry of Miners—Recognition of, by award of Albert Medal, proposed.
Q. Nov. 3, 1396.

Carmarthenshire—Muzzling Order, Date of withdrawing.
Q. Oct. 27, 798.

Montgomery, County of—Inquiry into Charities, Report Presented, *Oct. 27*, 793.

Penrhyn Quarry Dispute, Official Intervention suggested.
Q. Oct. 21, 351.

Wallace, Mr. [Perth]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 171; *Oct. 20*, 290, 300; *Oct. 21*, 370; *Oct. 29*, 1108.

Walton, Mr. J. Lawson [Leeds, S.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 21*, 376, 379, 400, 401, 413, 414; *Oct. 29*, 1128, 1137; *Oct. 30*, 1268, 1270.

Warner, Mr. T. Courtenay [Stafford, Lichfield].

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Oct. 28*, 971; *Oct. 29*, 1095; *Oct. 30*, 1212, 1275; *Nov. 3*, 1489.

Local Authorities (Bills in Parliament) Bill, 2R. *Oct. 21*, 452.

South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill, Lords Amendments, *Oct. 16*, 104.

Warwick, County of

Polling Districts—Order altering certain Polling Districts Presented, *Oct. 16*, 10, 24.

Water Provisional Order Bill

c. 1R.* *Oct. 20*, 202.
2R.* *Oct. 27*, 791.
Report* *Nov. 3*, 1379.

Water Supplies

Local Government Board Report Presented, *Nov. 3*, 1376, 1380.

Waterford

Pilotage By-Laws—Order in Council Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Suir Bridge Tolls, Loss occasioned to the City of Waterford — Legislation, proposed.
Q. Nov. 3, 1402.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty.]

Army Schools—Provision of adequate supply of Teachers, Religious Instruction, etc., *Oct. 22*, 468.

Boer Generals addressing Meeting at Cambridge—Disturbances, *Oct. 28*, 944; *Oct. 30*, 1193.

Cape Guardafui, Establishment of Lighthouse, proposed, *Oct. 29*, 1073.

Concentration Camps in South Africa—Cost of Maintenance since the War, *Oct. 28*, 944.

Hong Kong.
  Building Ordinances — Appointment of additional Inspectors, *Nov. 3*, 1388.
  Post Office—Date of constructing new building, *Oct. 27*, 802.
  Sanitation—Reports of Medical and Sanitary Experts, etc., *Oct. 22*, 469.

India.
  Agricultural Banks, Establishment of, *Oct. 22*, 463.
  Dhar-Confiscation of Ramchandra Rao's Property, owing to alleged complicity in Indian Mutiny, Claims of the Dewan of Dhar's other descendants, *Oct. 23*, 593.

[*cont.*

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
India—*cont.*
Food Crops, Increase in yield—Statistics, *Oct. 23*, 594.
Irrigation—Grant of 25 Lakhs, Allocation of, *Oct. 30*, 1183.
Land—Area in occupation and cultivation in each Province, *Oct. 29*, 1059.
Land Revenue Defaulters—Number of Writs and Warrants issued against, *Oct. 29*, 1058.
Natu, Sirdar Balvant Ramchandra, Claims of—Government Reply, *Oct. 22*, 462.
Police Administration, Appointment of Commission of Inquiry, *Oct. 23*, 595.
Public Works, Railways, and Irrigation, Revenue derived from, between Mar. 31, 1875, and Mar. 31, 1900; *Oct. 21*, 349.
Technical and Industrial Education, Development of—Government Intentions, *Oct. 28*, 939.
Naval Reserve—Drill, Facilities for men to perform their Annual Drill Abroad, *Oct. 30*, 1190.
North Sea Fisheries Convention—Date of Publication of Report, *Oct 23*, 613.
North Sea Fisheries Investigation, International Expenditure — Amounts to be expended by interested Countries, *Oct. 23*, 610.
Scotland.
Aird (Stornaway) School Play Ground—Provision of Shelter for use in severe weather, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1381,
Avoch Channel, Scheme for lighting—Carrying into effect, *Oct. 27*, 794.
Congested Districts Board—Expenditure on new Holdings since formation of the Board, *Nov, 3*, 1398.
Continuation Classes in the Crofting Counties, Number of—Amount of Grant to be expended, *Oct. 28*, 949.
Dingwall Barracks — Probability of Erection during ensuing year, *Oct. 28*, 941.
Dingwall and Cromarty Railway—Progress of Scheme, *Oct. 23*, 610.
Fisheries—Extension of the Three-Mile Limit proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1399.
Lewis, Island of.
Health Inquiry—Date of last visit of Local Government Board Inspector, *Nov. 3*, 1381.

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Scotland—*cont.*
Lewis, Island of—*cont.*
Number of Crofters and Cottars in the Island at the time of passing Crofters' Act, *Oct. 29*, 1075.
Portness Harbour, Condition of—Date of issue of Report, *Nov. 3*, 1400.
Sanitary Condition — Appointment of Local Government Board Inspector, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1399.
Schools—Children providing Peat for Class-room fires, Disregard of Circular issued by Scottish Education Department abolishing Custom, *Oct. 21*, 354.
Small Holdings, Establishment of, by the Congested Districts Board, proposed, *Oct. 23*, 613; *Oct. 29*, 1075.
Steamship Subsidy, Congested Districts Board, granting Subsidy to facilitate transit of Fish, proposed, *Oct. 28*, 950.
Swordle, Proposed Fishing Harbour—Refusal of Assistance by Congested Districts Board, *Oct. 30*, 1184.
Typhus, Death from in the District of Ness.
Insanitary Condition of house in which Mackay died — Public Health Authorities neglecting to remove Patient, *Oct. 27*, 796.
Interment Arrangements—Providing Isolation Hospital for District, *Oct. 22*, 474.
Moray Firth, Closing to Foreign Trawlers.
Christiania Fishery Conference, 1901—Resolution as to closing Firth, *Oct. 30*, 1192, 1193.
Copenhagen International Fishery Conference, Discussion at, *Oct. 23*, 613.
Sheshader, Footpath for use of Children attending the Aird School, Date of Completion, *Oct. 27*, 796.
Stornoway Mail Service, Delays in—Enforcement of Penalty Clause, *Oct. 22*, 474.

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*

Shetland Crofters—Difficulty in obtaining House Sites, Giving Local Authorities compulsory powers, proposed, *Nov 3*, 1398.

South African War—Boer Losses, Limit of time during which applications may be lodged, *Nov. 3*, 1391.

Transvaal—Cattle and Live Stock Imports, Tax on, *Oct. 29*, 1071.

Vaccination Exemption Certificate refused to Mr. J. F. Back—Subsequent imprisonment of Mr. Back for being without Certificate, *Oct. 21*, 353.

Welby, Lieut. Col. A. C. [Taunton]

Africa, South—Remount Farms at Clark's Siding, Fraudulent Transactions—Inquiry, *Oct. 20*, 215 ; *Oct. 22*, 465.

Lagos, Importation of Over-proof Spirits—Necessity for Legislation, *Nov. 3*, 1389.

Natal—Scarlet Fever Epidemic, Want of Precautions in isolating infected Battalion in Yeomanry, alleged, etc.—Inquiry proposed, *Oct. 22*, 464.

Nigeria—Importation of Liquor, Imposition of Prohibition Rates, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1389.

West Indies

Volcanic Eruptions, Correspondence relating to, with Map and Appendix, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 6, 17.

Westminster Abbey

Crucifix erected in Edward the Confessor's Chapel, Authority for.
Q. Oct. 28, 949.

Westport Rural District Council

Land Question, Compulsory Purchase — Recommendations of District Council.
Q. Nov. 3, 1402.

Wexford, South

Roads, Damage to, by Traction Engines—Compelling Owners to Repair or Contribute towards Up-keep of Roads.
Q. Oct. 27, 801.

Wheat

Returns — Double Return proposed, Distinguishing between good and inferior Wheat
Q. Oct. 22, 472.

White Estate, Ireland

Delay in Sale to Tenants.
Q. Oct. 23, 601.

White, Mr. G. [Norfolk, N.W.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 195, 196 ; *Oct. 23*, 649, 711.

Whiteley, Mr. G. [York, W.R., Pudsey]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 23*, 656.

Whitley, Mr. J. H. [Halifax]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 17*, 157, 192 ; *Oct. 20*, 274 ; *Oct. 21*, 409 ; *Oct. 22*, 497, 543, 549 ; *Oct. 23*, 679 ; *Oct. 28*, 984, 1025, 1034, 1048, 1053 ; *Oct. 29*, 1089, 1090, 1101, 1109, 1157, 1159 ; *Oct. 30*, 1218, 1280, 1281, 1282, 1284, 1285, 1286 ; *Oct. 31*, 1357, 1362, 1362 ; *Nov. 3*, 1455.

Patent Law Amendment Bill, *con. Oct. 21*, 447.

Wick Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill

c. 1R.* *Oct. 17*, 137.
2R.* *Oct. 27*, 791.
*com.** *Oct. 28*, 937.
3R.* *Oct. 29*, 1057.
l. 1R.* *Nov. 3*, 1373.

Williams, Rt. Hon. J. Powell [Birmingham, S.]

Bright, Mr. J., Statue in the House of Commons — Removing to better position in the Outer Lobby proposed, *Oct. 23*, 615, 616.

Wilson, Mr. F. W. [Norfolk, Mid.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Oct. 28*, 971.

Education Committee—Eligibility of Ministers of Religion *Oct. 22*, 467.

Wilson, Mr. J. W. [Worcestershire, N.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com., Oct. 28*, 1039.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *com. Oct. 22*, 564.

Winter Assizes

Orders in Council relating to, Presented, *Oct. 21*, 347 ; *Nov. 3*, 1377.

Wireless Telegraphy

Marconi System, Use of, to maintain communication between Scotland and England, proposed.
Q. Oct. 27, 810.

Women

Education (England and Wales) Bill—Capacities in which Women may Act under the Bill.
Q. Oct. 27, 828.

Woolwich Arsenal

Foremen's Pensions under New Pension Scheme.
Q. Oct. 28, 945.

Paymaster acting as Assessor and Collector of Income Tax, Altering Procedure, proposed.
Q. Oct. 27, 805.

Worcester
- Census—Return Presented, *Oct. 16*, 4, 21.
- Parliamentary By-Election—New Member sworn for Eastern Division, *Oct. 16*, 15.

Workmen's Compensation Act
- Medical Referee acting as Medical Witness, Legality of—Case of Peart *v.* Furness.
  - *Q. Nov. 3*, 1395.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. Stuart [Sheffield, Hallam]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com. Oct. 21*, 393.

Wylie, Mr. A. [Dumbartonshire]
- House of Commons Ventilation, Date of issue of Report of Select Committee of Inquiry—Improvements in Sanitary Conditions, *Oct. 30*, 1194.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Dover].
- Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, 2R. *Oct. 22*, 550.
- Arms and Ammunition imported from Birmingham — Provisions of Peace Preservation Act of 1881, *Nov. 3*, 1400.
- Belfast.
  - Custom House Steps, Public Meetings held on.
    - Collection of Money, Prohibition, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 813.
    - Disturbances, Railing in Steps proposed, *Oct. 21*, 356; *Oct. 23*, 625.
    - Reasons for refusing to rail in steps, etc., *Oct. 23*, 695.
  - Orange Institution, Illegal Pressure on Member for South Belfast and Mr. S. Boal—Proclaiming Association proposed, *Oct. 27*, 814.
  - Unlawful Assemblies, Prosecutions for, *Nov. 3*, 1404.
- Blacksod Bay as Port of Call for Subsidised Line of Steamers to run between Canada and Liverpool—Agreement between British and Canadian Governments, alleged, *Oct. 22*, 483.
- Cavan and Leitrim Assizes, White Glove Calendar—Withdrawal of Proclamation under the Crimes Act proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1403.
- Congested Districts Board.
  - Expenditure—Return proposed, *Oct. 27*, 818.
  - Number of Acres of Land purchased since January, 1900, etc., *Nov. 3*, 1401.
- Coomenaum Slip—Estimates for Slip submitted by Surveyor of the Kerry County Council, Rejection by Congested Districts Board, *Oct. 27*, 818.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Constabulary, Royal Irish.
  - Anderson, Sergeant.
    - Case of—Discussion in the House, *Oct. 23*, 634.
    - Duties, Nature of, *Oct. 27*, 823.
    - Retention in the Force, *Oct. 23*, 627, 628.
  - Castlerea Union—Extra Force stationed in, Number of—Cost, etc., *Oct. 28*, 951.
  - Promotions, System of, grounded on the success of Prosecutions, alleged *Oct. 23*, 628.
  - Sullivan, Sergeant, Charges against—Retention of Sullivan in the Service, etc.
    - Accomplice of Ex-Sergeant Sheridan, alleged—Retention in Force, etc., *Oct. 20*, 236, 237.
    - Action of the Government, Evidence of Handwriting Experts at Sullivan's trial etc. *Oct. 20*, 230, 332.
      - Nolan's, Mr. T. P., Evidence as handwriting Expert, *Oct. 27*, 813.
      - Permission given to Mr. Nolan to absent himself from Duties in Local Government Board Office — Remuneration for Employment as handwriting expert, etc., *Oct. 27*, 814.
    - Place where Sullivan is stationed —Rank, *Oct. 22*, 483.
    - Promotion since Trial in 1898, *Oct. 27*, 821.
    - Prosecution of Sullivan for Perjury proposed, *Oct. 20*, 243.
  - Supervision of Pat Meany, *Oct. 27*, 815.
- Cork.
  - Rural District Improvement Scheme.
    - Delay in sanction of, *Oct. 23*, 619.
    - Refusal to Sanction, *Oct. 27*, 821.
  - State of—Withdrawal of Proclamation, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1401.
  - Steamship Service, Subsidy to Clyde Shipping Company granted by Congested Districts Board as a tentative Measure, *Oct. 20*, 231.
- Court Houses, Use of, for Political Meetings.
  - Instructions to Sheriffs, *Oct. 23*, 623.
  - Public Meetings, Use of Court Houses for—High Sheriffs right to forbid Meetings, *Oct. 27*, 824.
- Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887.
  - Administration of Act, History of Agitation preceding Proclamation under the Crimes Act, Prison treatment of Irish Members, etc., *Oct. 27*, 914, 916, 920, 921, 930.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Crimes (Ireland) Act—*cont.*
  - County and District Councillors, Number convicted, and number sentenced to hard labour during past 12 months, *Oct. 23*, 619.
  - Courts, Constitution of, *Oct. 27*, 822.
  - Hard Labour Sentences.
    - Disqualification for Service on any Local Body for five years, *Oct. 22*, 477.
    - Government Instructions to Resident Magistrates alleged, *Oct. 27*, 819.
    - Harris, Mr., Sentence on, Judge Adams' Mitigation of Sentence imposed by Resident Magistrates — Furnishing Copy of Judgment to Resident Magistrates, proposed, *Oct. 27*, 816.
    - Instructions given by Mr. Wyndham, alleged — Denial, *Oct. 22*, 482.
    - Number of Sentences between July 1887 and Sept. 1892, etc.; *Oct. 20*, 236, 238, 239; *Oct. 22*, 481.
  - O'Dwyer, Mr. M., Sentence of hard labour—Appeal against Sentence, *Oct. 23*, 624.
  - Political Prisoners, Treatment of, *Oct. 29*, 1078.
  - Sligo Prison, Number of Prisoners in under the Act on April 24, and October 23, 1902; *Oct. 30*, 1195.
- Dingle.
  - Harbour, Application for Grant under Marine Works Bill—Consideration of Application, *Oct. 23*, 620.
  - Railway — Grant for Carrying out Alterations recommended by Local Government Board Inspector, proposed, *Oct. 23*, 621.
- Dublin.
  - Custom House — Nuns begging for Alms on Pay days, Abolishing Practice proposed, *Oct. 30*, 1194, 1195.
  - Proclamation of—Illegal Matter contained in the *Irish People* Newspaper, *Oct. 27*, 815.
- Executions.
  - Coroners' Powers to detain Executioners and compel them to give Evidence at the Inquests —Rules, *Oct. 22*, 478.
    - Authority detaining Executioner Pending Coroner's Decisions — New Rules, *Oct. 27*, 819, 820.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 22*, 570, 580.
- Fenit Pier—Reducing Charge on Loan for Construction of Pier, to Treasury rate of borrowing Money, proposed, *Oct. 23*, 621.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *Oct. 21*, 453.
- Hospital Roads, Condition of — Local Government Boards' Power of Intervention, *Oct. 22*, 476.
- Irish Nationalist Members, Imprisonment of, under the Crimes (Ireland) Act.
  - Communications to the Speaker—Infringement of Rule, alleged, *Oct. 22*, 232, 233.
    - Instructions to Magistrates, *Oct. 23*, 622, *Oct. 27*, 824.
  - Number sentenced between *Aug. 8* and *Oct. 20*, 1902—Terms of Imprisonment, etc., *Oct. 20*, 232.
  - Reddy, Mr. Arrest of—Communication to the Speaker, *Oct. 27*, 824.
  - Speeches—Number of Members imprisoned for Political Speeches during past year, Number sentenced to Hard Labour—Dietary, etc., *Oct. 20*, 237.
  - Treatment of Prisoners in Tullamore Gaol, Number sentenced to Hard Labour, etc. *Oct. 21*, 355.
- Kanturk and Newmarket Railway—Complaints as to Traffic Arrangements, *Oct. 29*, 1077.
- Labourers.
  - Allotments — Tipperary Improvement Scheme, Rejection of Applications, *Oct. 23*, 618.
  - Housing of, Legislation—Government intentions, *Oct. 23*, 618.
- Land Purchase Acts (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Oct. 20*, 343.
- Land Question.
  - Recommendations of Westport Rural District Council, *Nov. 3*, 1402.
  - Settlement could be effected only by the Parties concerned — Mr. Wyndham's Statement.
    - *Os.* Mr. W. O'Brien, *Oct. 27*, 891; Mr. Wyndham, 927.
- Local Government (Ireland Act) (Amendment) Bill, Facilities for Discussion, *Nov. 3*, 1404.
- Local Taxation Account—Distribution of Accumulated Balance, *Oct. 23*, 620.
- McCloskey, T., Suit against District Inspector Holmes—Costs, *Oct. 27*, 823.
- Macroom Union, Labourers' Cottages—W. Creedon's Application for Cottage, *Oct. 22*, 476.
- Marine Works (Ireland) Act, Applications for assistance under the Act—Giving effect to Provisions of Act at an early date, *Oct. 21*, 354.
- Mohill Rural District Council—Unexpended Balance appropriated by the County Inquiry, *Nov. 3*, 1401.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*

Muldowney, Convict, Release of, proposed, *Oct. 28*, 950.

Mullingar Quarter Sessions, Grand Jury passing Resolution requesting withdrawal of Proclamation of County—Conduct of Judge Curran, *Oct. 20*, 241.

O'Flanagan, Mr., Imprisonment under the Crimes (Ireland) Act.

Development of Insanity, Report of Governor of Limerick Prison, *Oct. 20*, 244.

Inquiry, proposed—Scope of Inquiry, etc., *Oct. 22*, 479, 480.

Poor Law Audits — Appointment of Inspectors and Auditors from the Poor Law Service, proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1403.

Prison Warders, Hours of Duty—Inquiry proposed, *Oct. 27*, 821.

Prisons, Closing of—Re-opening proposed in view of Number of Convictions under the Crimes Act, *Oct. 27*, 814.

Queen's County — Proclamation under Crimes Act—Freedom from Agrarian Crime, alleged, Proposal to withdraw Proclamation, *Oct. 27*, 823.

Rae Estate, Delay in Sale—Report of Inspector, *Oct. 22*, 483.

Railway Goods Rates—Newcastle West to Liverpool via Waterford—Exceptional rate for Butter, *Oct. 27*, 817.

Resident Magistrates — Communication with Officials at Dublin Castle during last three months, Nature of, *Oct. 29*, 1076.

Skibbereen Labourers' Cottages, Rural District Council application for Loan, *Oct. 29*, 1079.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*

Suir Bridge Tolls, Loss occasioned to the City of Waterford—Legislation proposed, *Nov. 3*, 1403.

Swords Borough School Scholarship—M. Keegan disqualified by the Examiners, *Oct. 29*, 1077.

Yeomanry, Imperial

Machine Guns, Number of Regiments supplied with.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 464.

Natal—Scarlet Fever Epidemic, Want of Precautions in isolating infected Battalion of Imperial Yeomanry, alleged—Inquiry proposed.
Q. *Oct. 22*, 464.

Officers granted Commissions in the Army for Services in the field—Placing on equal footing with those gazetted from Sandhurst.
Q. *Nov. 3*, 1391.

Outfits, Cost of, in Jan. 1900, compared with Cost of Cavalry Outfit.
Q. *Oct. 23*, 602.

York, County of

Parliamentary By-Election—New Writ, *Oct. 23*, 590.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, W.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *com.*, *Oct. 17*, 189; *Oct. 20*, 261; *Oct. 21*, 381; *Oct. 24*, 729, 739, 740; *Oct. 28*, 953, 970, 1002, 1039; *Oct. 29*, 1120; *Oct. 30*, 1241, 1242; *Nov. 3*, 1451.

Zanzibar

Trade Report, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 2, 17.

Zinc Mines

Night Work by Young Persons—Exemption Order, Presented, *Oct. 16*, 10, 24.